CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE
# MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 1 MARCH Vol. XLVI

## SIR CYRIL NORWOOD, 1875—1956

SIR Cyril Norwood passed away at his home, Iwerne Minster, Dorset, on March 13. *The Times*, in its notice of his death extending to over a column, emphasized his great contribution to English education in a transitional period fraught with great national problems.

With his educational policy we are in profound agreement, but it is not to that we wish to direct attention in our memorial notice: it is to his personal influence as a fellow-member of the Church of England.

A scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, an outstanding cricketer, he secured his First in Mods., and in Greats; he passed out top of the Civil Service competitive examinations and became an Admiralty clerk. He soon exchanged this routine occupation for a classical mastership in Leeds Grammar School. After five years there he became head of Bristol Grammar School. Here his educational qualities were strikingly manifest. In 1920 he was elected Master of Marlborough and placed Marlborough amongst the first half dozen of the leading public schools. Next he became Headmaster of Harrow, at that time sorely in need of creative leadership.

In 1934, having accomplished, not without opposition, his task at Harrow, he was elected Head of his old college, from the Presidentship of which he retired in 1946.

v.46
1956/
57



But Norwood in the educational world of England was much more than an extraordinarily successful headmaster. He was a national interpreter of English educational ideals and of what ought to be their methods of achievement and development. He acquired this national experience not only by his school mastering, but also from his varied experiences gained by his membership of a number of very influential educational organizations created to face and if possible to solve educational problems produced by our two great world wars. His published contributions in this field are set forth pre-eminently in the *Norwood Report* (issued as Chairman of Committee on Curricula and Examinations after the the war), and in the *Higher Education of Boys in England: The English Educational System: The English Tradition in Education.*

His supreme influence as an English educationist is strikingly presented by the *Manchester Guardian* in its obituary notice of March 14.

> 'He was a great teacher and a great reformer. He did more than any man of his generation to maintain and revive the root principles of education, and to prevent the ossification of the public school system by tradition. But in the last resort his was the strength of the spirit, and it was because his dedication of his own powers was so complete that he gave unsparingly in small unnoticed things as well as in great.

But it is Norwood's influence, not as a schoolmaster, but as a great English Churchman whose ideals demand most serious attention from the clerical leaders of our Church that we are concerned to emphasize here.

In 1937, Norwood was elected President of the Modern Churchmen's Union: among his predecessors in that office were Sir Thomas Dyke Acland, Professor Percy Gardner, Canon M. G. Glazebrook (Headmaster of Clifton), Dean Hastings Rashdall, Dean Inge and Dean Matthews of St. Paul's—the period of learned deans in our national Church.

Norwood held the M.C.U. Presidency for the double period of ten years and contributed a number of Presidential addresses published in the *Modern Churchman.* He was succeeded by our present President, Sir Henry Self.

Norwood succeeded Dr. Macan, Master of University College, Oxford, as Chairman of the Governing Body of Ripon Hall, which he retained until 1946.

Norwood had long been a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union and for him the Christian Religion was the basic factor in English civilization. He was a comprehensive, central and critical Churchman. For him the primary elements in the

Religion of Christ are not dominantly sacramental, ecclesiastical nor miraculous but spiritual, moral and rational.

He was no Humanist in the modern technical sense. He needed faith in God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: he needed daily communion with God maintained by Prayer and by whole-hearted obedience to the Divine Will and the resolute many-sided endeavour to promote the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth as it is in heaven: he held that the three 'great values' of the Christian Religion were *love*—love to God and love to one's neighbour: *light* secured by loyalty to our increasing knowledge of truth: *eternal life* granted to man in the essential good news of the Gospel as given by Jesus Himself and by the many-sided developments of that eternal life by the manifold gift of the spirit as predicted in the Fourth Gospel:

> 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth.' (*John* xvi; 12.)

To those who desire something more detailed than is provided by this summary of his religious convictions and Church of England policy, we would refer them to two ecclesiastical documents to which he attached high importance.

Norwood attached the highest value to the *Doctrinal Report.* In addressing the Modern Churchmen's Conference in 1947 he said:

> '[1] This freedom to differ in matters which are not essential, even though they appear essential to some, has been secured for us by the *Doctrinal Report,* and I have always regarded that document, now too little known and too infrequently quoted, as at once the justification of our Union and the provider of the sole basis on which our Church and the Free Churches and tens of thousands who are in sympathy with us but not in communion, can re-unite in a living Fellowship.'

The second document—perhaps modesty ought to forbid my reference to it—is my own little treatise *Basic Christianity* (Blackwells, 4th edition, 1944).

Of this Norwood writes:

> 'If you desire a simple and clear statement of what I believe this religion to be, you will find it in that excellent brief book *Basic Christianity—the World Religion*[2], in which the Editor of the *Modern Churchman* has rendered not the least of his many services to the cause of true religion: I hope that the book will circulate far and wide and pass through many editions.'

[1] Vol. xxxvi, p. 112, Presidential Address at the 29th Conference of Modern Churchmen.

[2] p. 113, Vol. xxxv, Presidential Address, Conference at Oxford, 1945, subject: 'The Religion the World Needs'.

336804

# SIGNS OF THE TIMES

## Present Trends in English Religion: Modern Churchmen's Conference 1956

The Thirty-Ninth Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen will be held at Girton College, Cambridge, from Monday, 23rd, to Friday, 27th July.

The theme of the Conference is, 'Present Trends in English Religion', which will be discussed in a series of papers by eminent speakers.

Two facts must be clear to any observer of the religious scene in England to-day. One is the vigour and energy with which the Roman Catholic Church is seeking to extend its influence, of which the recent advertising campaign in the national press has been one noticeable aspect. The other is the recrudescence of Fundamentalism, which goes hand in hand with a crude doctrine of the Atonement, and has been publicized by recent evangelistic campaigns.

Where does the Church of England stand in regard to these pressures on either flank?

This is a competitive age, and in religion, as in business, when others seems to be successful the temptation is to copy their methods, echo their catch-phrases, profess to offer something 'just as good'. Whether or not this is good business, in religion it is a disastrous policy. The authoritarianism of Roman Catholic Christianity and the naïve biblicalism of Billy Graham Christianity are not their strength but their weakness. The Church of England has a different tradition, and we believe it has a unique part to play in Christendom as well as in the life of the English nation. But if it is to continue to play that part, our Church must have confidence in its comprehensiveness, continuity and freedom. These qualities are its real strength, and because of them it has not less to offer but more.

In discussing these and other questions, the Annual Conference will be making a notable contribution to our understanding of the religious situation in this country.

## The Primate and Reunion with Methodists

Under the heading 'Church Talks with Methodists' the *Church Times* of March 2, published the following announcement:

> 'The Archbishop of Canterbury has appointed the following delegates to represent the Church in its forthcoming discussions with the Methodists:

The Bishop of Chichester; the Bishop of Liverpool; the Bishop of Oxford; Canon S. L. Greenslade; Canon Eric Kemp; the Rev. H. Riley, Vicar of St. Augustine's, Kilburn; the Rev. F. J. Taylor, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford; the Rev. L. du Toit, Vicar of St. Mary's, Windermere; Miss S. Lister, a member of the Central Council for Women's Church Work: Professor H. A. Hodges, Professor of Philosophy at Reading University; and Dr. V. A. Loach, Registrar of Leeds University.

The Methodist delegates include the Rev. Dr. Leslie Weatherhead, President of the Methodist Conference, and Dr. W. E. Sangster.

It is our conviction that the Bishops of the Church of England (not the whole Anglican Communion) should take the *first step* on their side in the achievement of the much to be desired reunion with the Methodists by declaring that all Methodist communicants are most welcome to communicate at the Lord's Table in the National Church and, indeed, not only Methodists but all Free Church Communicants should they desire to do so. The Prayer Book prohibition of 1662 which prescribes episcopal confirmation as a necessary preliminary to receiving Holy Communion should be observed in the case of those who have been baptized in the Church of England, but would be optional in the case of communicants in our Free Church denominations who desire also to be received as communicants in the national Church. Intercommunon exists practically in the Free Churches to-day and Free Churchmen, as a first step in the recovery of Christian Reunion, ought to be welcomed by the Church of England at the Lord's Table to-day.

In urging this, we are not advocating the abandonment of episcopal confirmation as practised in the Church of England to-day—it is a most valuable institution and by our retention and practice of it for our own members we witness to the very high value we place upon it.

What we are advocating is the non-insistence on episcopal confirmation where such insistence can be a barrier to the recovery of full Christian fellowship with our Free Church brethren.

For at least a century no English bishops crossed the Atlantic to perform confirmations in the U.S.A. Confirmations during that period were performed not by Bishops, but by delegated Archdeacons.

Mass may be received in the Roman Catholic Church before Confirmation is administered. Therefore, let our Church of England Episcopate begin their Reunion talks with a declaration of the *validity* (we do not say *regularity*—that is a lesser matter) of the Methodist Service of Holy Communion, and do let us recognize this at the outset by practical action.

### Free Church Adjustment, Not Abolition

May we now venture to look over the hedge and offer, we hope, not an impertinent suggestion to our Free Church brethren as to their method of Reunion to be accomplished in the National Church.

In the interest of the influence of the Christian Religion in this country this anticipated reunion ought to be accomplished in such a way that the four great English Free Churches—Congregationalist (or Independents), the Baptists (or Anabaptists), English Presbyterians, Methodists—ought not to lose their identity and the particular contribution to our national religion as the result of it.

The admirable Bampton Lectures of G. H. Curteis, a very loyal and clear-headed Anglican, indicate the causes and significant contributions which each of these four Reformation movements sought to achieve—and each of them had a real religious value.

In selecting these four we do not wish for a moment to indicate that other English Reformation movements, e.g. the Society of Friends, the Salvation Army, etc., have not had very valuable contributions to make to our English religious life, but as they are not included in the present projected Reunion Movement headed by the Primate we are not now dealing with them here.

Our conviction is that these four great Free Churches should re-enter the National Church as Christian Corporations retaining their property, their buildings, their ministries and their organizations and powers of self-government and only making such alterations in these as may be from time to time territorially demanded for the perfecting of their co-operation with our Anglican diocesan and parochial system.

In short that they should possess and retain, after their reunion with the national Church, the degree of corporate independence, identity of objective, characteristic liturgical devotion, initiative of missionary enterprise such as is possessed and retained by the great Religious Orders—Benedictines, Carmelites, Dominicans, Franciscans and Jesuits—in the Roman Catholic Church.

What we are advocating is adjustment, not abolition, in the cause of English Reunion.

### Misleading Phrases in Our Church Services

A distressing controversey between a bishop and one of his clergy recently secured publicity in our provincial press. To preclude personalities we withold names.

The Incumbent of a small country town desired his bishop to support the policy of replacing inaccurate phraseology in our

church formularies by those demanded by modern knowledge, especially in the teaching given in our church schools.

In a provincial press cutting the Bishop, in commenting on the Vicar's demand, was reported as saying :

> 'He will not admit that God is almighty. He refuses to say 'Lead us not into temptation', because he says that God could not lead anyone into temptation. He sets himself up as a great authority. He ought to found a Church of his own if he feels like that and get out of the Church of England.

It is obvious that much had preceded—and that not a little was bound to follow—such a statement by the Bishop, particularly as the Incumbent is a learned philologist who had in his earlier life been engaged in translating the Scriptures into two hitherto unwritten languages, one in Eastern Asia and the other in Northern South America and the problem of accurate theological translation of Biblical phrases had been in his mind for many years.

The personal aspects of this controversy we are not concerned with here. What we are concerned with is the need for further episcopal action in solving this problem of misleading phrases preserved and repeated in our public Christian worship. We cite examples which emphasize a need for such urgent emendations.

*'Almighty God'*

Almighty contradicts our human experience of the limitations of Divine action : 'If God be Almighty why does He not stop the war?' 'If God be Almighty why has He permitted evil to exist in the Universe He has created? 'If God be Almighty, then He is not all good of if he be all good then He is not Almighty.'

Our English theologians, e.g. Rashdall, have discussed these problems connected with the use of the title Almighty. But why obtrude these problems in our Church Services by the use of this term in our devotions? Moreover Almighty is not a correct translation of our Biblical terminology either in the Semitic or Greek languages.

Almighty is derived from the inaccurate *omnipotens* of the Latin Vulgate. Some critics suggest the substitution of the accurate All-Ruler instead of Almighty. But why not omit Almighty altogether.

*'His Only Son'*

This phrase gives the impression that Jesus Christ is the sole Son of God and that we, and our fellow-men are not sons of God.

Yet such a statement ignores the Christian Gospel of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man. And the great declaration in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel:

> 'As many as received Him to them gave He the right to become children of God . . . (*John* i, 12 R.V.) (cf. *Gal.* iv, 6) "And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father".'

Here the difficulty cannot be met by eliminating the word translated '*only*' which expresses—in the original—quality, not number. Hence some critics would replace *only* by *unique*. But unique is not a Biblical phrase. A much better rendering is '*Beloved*' as in the designation of his Messiahship vouchsafed to Jesus Himself at His Baptism. 'Thou art my Beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.' (*Mark* i, 11, cf. *Psalm* ii, 7.)

'*Everlasting Life*'

Everlasting means endless or unending; but it is not the endlessness of the life, but the quality of the life which ought to be emphasized—the Life of God in the soul of man shared by Christians, the quality or the outcome of their communion with the Divine through the Divine Son. 'I came that they may have life (*zoe*) and have it abundantly' (*John* x, 10). This is expressed by the word *eternal* (Gk. *aionios*).

# THE LEGACY OF THE REFORMATION

By Norman Sykes, F.B.A., Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge

IN one of the scenes of Mr. Bernard Shaw's chronicle play, *St. Joan*, the author introduces a lengthy dialogue between two typical figures of medieval society, an English nobleman and a French bishop, who discuss together the forces making for the downfall of that order and the emergence of the modern world. With characteristic paradox the dramatist puts into the mouth of the Earl of Warwick his diagnosis of the religious factor.

> 'It is the protest of the individual soul against the interference of priest or peer between the private man and his God. I should call it Protestantism if I had to find a name for it.'

To this the Bishop of Beauvais replies by identifying its political counterpart as exemplified in the career of Joan of Arc.

> 'Call this side of her heresy, Nationalism, if you will. I can find no better name for it.'

The playwright, of course, was not interested in historical accuracy; and it may well be questioned whether even the most prescient of French ecclesiastics or the most penetrating of English nobles at such an early date would have crystallized their prognosis of the nature and effect of the twin forces which were to burst asunder the unity of the medieval *Respublica Christiana*. But there can be no doubt that it was the fusion of these two elements of rebellion which produced the Reformation of the sixteenth century and determined its historical characteristics and expression.

Of the imperative necessity for an ecclesiastical reformation there can be no doubt; nor was there any in the minds of contemporaries. For more than a century before the storm of revolt broke, it had been a commonplace amongst the churchmen that the Church stood in urgent need of reform *tam in capite quam in membris*. In the most recent volume of his history of *The Religious Orders in England*, Professor Knowles has observed that

> 'the extravagant claims to total and immediate dominion in the spiritual and temporal spheres put forward on behalf of the papacy by Giles of Rome and others were echoed not only in such pronouncements as the bull *Unam sanctam* of Boniface VIII, but also in the papal claims for taxation and the provision to all kinds of benefice, supported often by alleged historical surrenders such as those of Constantine or King John.'

An equally recent Bampton lecturer, surveying the relations of Christianity with the state from the apostolic age to the sixteenth century, has likewise ventured boldy to characterize the history of

the later medieval papacy as, 'this cumulative moral suicide'; and has emphasized 'the slowness with which opinion turned against the papacy, the long delay of the revolt against it.' Attempts, indeed, had not been lacking to effect the much-needed reforms, particularly through the agency of the Conciliar Movement of the fifteenth century, which though called primarily to heal the schism caused by the spectacle of two rival popes, was charged also with the task of reformation. The failure of these revived General Councils to carry through the latter responsibility led ultimately to the employment of other and harsher means. It was a favourite dictum of Figgis that with the failure of the Conciliar Movement the methods of 1688 having been tried and found wanting, recourse must be had to the more violent measures of 1789. But although the Reformation of the sixteenth century was a rebellion against the medieval church and papacy, both its champions and the means at their disposal were inherited from that society. Nearly all the leading Reformers were themselves clerics of the medieval church; Luther was an Augustinian Eremite, Zwingli a secular priest; Calvin, indeed, though destined and educated for, did not proceed to the priesthood; whilst the third Elizabethan archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift, related how he had learned the principles of reformation from his uncle Robert Whitgift, abbot of the Augustinian house at Wellow, near Grimsby; who, as he recollected, had often said 'that he had read the Holy Scriptures over and over, but could never find there that their religion was founded by God', and had therefore foretold that it could not long continue. Not only the personnel, therefore, but likewise the instruments of the Reformation, were taken from the bosom of the medieval church; and not merely the political arguments, but also the theological and religious elements. For one of the most important and influential characteristics of later medieval theological thought was its movement away from emphasis on the Reason of God to exaltation of His Will. The marriage of faith and reason which had been the achievement of Aquinas and thirteenth-century scholasticism was suffering a rude divorce at the hands of the Occamists; who, despairing of finding irrefragable rational proofs of the existence and attributes of God, tended to stress Revelation as the one, sole, ultimate authority, apart from which all was confusion and uncertainty. This led in turn, on the one hand to emphasis upon the Will of God as authenticating Revelation (not on the ground of its intrinsic reasonableness, but on that of the divine *Fiat*), and on the other hand to a type of moral theology which sought for the basis of the difference between right and wrong in the arbitrary decrees

of God. When transferred to the domain of theology proper, this vogue led to a strong emphasis on predestinarianism and a concentration of interest on the doctrines of freewill and irresistible divine grace. Indeed it has been observed of a fourteenth-century Archbishop of Canterbury, the principal exponent of predestinarianism of his age in England, that 'the Calvinist theology is the heir to Thomas Bradwardine'. Here indeed the Reformation cast its shadows visibly and recognisably before. Moreover, other tendencies of later medieval thought and practice pointed in the same direction of undermining the traditional authority of the Visible Church. John Whitgift remembered his uncle's insistence on the Holy Scriptures as the touchstone and standard of belief; and both Wyclif and Huss had questioned the exclusive right of the Church to be the sole interpreter of the Bible, both had made the popularization of a vernacular Bible one of their principal objectives; and from this position it was but a short journey to the affirmation of the principle of private judgment as the ultimate authority in interpreting Holy Scripture and determining belief. Individualism, indeed, was coming into its own not less in philosophy than in political thought; and perhaps most significant of all, in religious practice. For the *devotio moderna*, which was one of the most characteristic and influential later medieval movements of purely religious provenance, emphasized the mystical element in religion, in itself an essentially individual experience, and by consequence weakened the corporate representation of Christianity. Indeed, if the *Imitatio Christi* is rightly to be associated with this school, it illustrates further the personal as against the corporate expression and experience of religion, and domesticates the individualist tendency in the heart of Christianity. Even Gerson, one of the leaders of the Conciliar movement, was much affected by the conception of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ.

It was natural that there should not be lacking *politiques*, ready and avid to turn to the profit of temporal rulers and to the disadvantage of the papacy, such tendencies towards depreciation of the rôle of the corporate Church in Christian life. The most famous and important was Marsilius of Padua, who laid the axe to the root of the tree of papal pretensions. For he denied to St. Peter, and therefore to his successors, any coercive jurisdiction over the other apostles and bishops; and he left to the papacy only a primacy of honour, and not even that *divino jure;* but just as, for example, the professors at Orléans might defer to the judgment of the great doctors of Paris in academic matters. Marsilius went yet further in his dissolvent criticism; holding that

in spiritual matters the New Testament was the only authoritative law of God, and that Scripture allows no authority to compel obedience even to the laws of the Gospel; so that the clergy were physicians of the soul only by exercise of persuasion in teaching and warning. Moreover all faithful Christians were churchmen, *viri ecclesiastici*, and the supreme authority of Christendom was a *Generale Concilium Fidelium*, including priests and laity as well as the episcopate. The vacuum thus created by the stripping from the ecclesiastical society of all coercive power, was to be filled by the state; which became evidently the superior authority, with the revenues of ecclesiastical corporations at its disposal, enjoying the right to summon General Councils and to confirm their decrees, exercising no compulsion in the sphere of belief and deciding according to its own standards what, if any, ecclesiastical censures should be supported by the coercive power of the civil arm. Now indeed the wheel had turned full circle; for as Dr. Previté-Orton summarised the teaching of Marsilius, it embraced 'an affection for his Presbyterian system, his Erastianism and a passionate republicanism'; whilst the Bampton lecturer above quoted adds that 'it is not merely that Marsilius anticipated Luther's rejection *in toto* of the Papacy as a necessary part of the Christian Church; it is rather that he was the founder of the secularist view of the State'. In reply to these dangerous tendencies the papacy heightened and tightened its absolute and exclusive claims; and the religious situation at the close of the middle ages has been succinctly summarised by Mr. T. M. Parker as 'authoritarianism in the field of ecclesiastical politics, individualism in the field of devotion; it is an explosive juxtaposition'.

> 'A perfect reformation of any church in this world,' wrote the seventeenth-century Cambridge church historian, Thomas Fuller, 'may be desired but not hoped for. I speak not this to dishearten men from endeavouring a perfect reformation, but to keep them from being disheartened when they see the same cannot be exactly observed.'

No better text could be found for the theme of a lecture on the legacy of the Reformation. For, as the same writer further observed, 'in reformations of great importance, the violent driving of the nail will either break the head, or bow the point thereof, or rive and split that which should be fastened therewith'. To which he added the rider that 'God's work must be done, not lazily, but leisurely; haste maketh waste in this kind.' It was the tragedy of the sixteenth-century Protestant reformation that its blows were struck with such violence as to break irreparably the unity of the Church and to tear into many fragments the seamless robe of Catholicity. On the other hand, it was the equally fatal

error of the Roman Church to defer its reformation until finally it became a case of too late and too little, for though the work of God must be done leisurely, it may be done so leisurely as in effect to be both too lazily and too tardily attempted. The formidable corpus of needful reforms may be sufficiently judged from the *Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia*, drawn up in 1537 by a committee which included four influential Cardinals, and which set forth a comprehensive catalogue of things amiss. But this was twenty years after the match had been set to the tinder by Luther's challenging theses concerning indulgences; and eight more fateful years were to elapse before the Council of Trent opened its long and much-interrupted sessions. Delays are proverbially dangerous, and in this case they were also disastrous. For during the early years of the Reformation the little society of the Oratory of Divine Love in Italy embraced a number of eminent divines whose influence might have prevailed to heal the incipient revolt. Indeed that the very names of Contarini, Giberti, Cajetan, Pole, Sadoleto, Morone and Caraffa illustrate the importance of the company; and when it is added that four received the cardinal's hat from Paul III, the potentialities of their association are evident. Moreover their hopes came within at least a distant prospect of realization at the Colloquy of Ratisbon in 1541, when discussions with Lutheran leaders reached agreement on the fundamental articles of Original Sin, Free Will and Justification, and agreement to tolerate differences of practice in regard to marriage of clergy and communion in both species, whilst the possibility of an agreement to differ on Eucharistic belief seemed not altogether impossible. It was, therefore, perhaps the greatest single tragedy of the ecclesiastical history of the sixteenth century that this bright promise faded and then was overwhelmed in darkness; as first Caraffa moved away from his colleagues towards a narrower and less conciliatory conception of counter-reformation, and next Contarini and Giberti both died by the end of 1543. Thus the fairest opportunity of stilling the storm in its initial stages was lost. Instead there came a great wind from the wilderness and smote the four corners of the house, and it fell.

The first and most evident legacy of the Reformation therefore was the shattering of the unity of the medieval western Church. It is true indeed that the schism beween East and West had for some considerable time deprived the Church of its vaunted note of unity; and that so long as Rome and Byzantium eyed each other with undisguised hostility the witness of Christianity and the riches of the Church were alike weakened and impoverished. But in the west, at least in ideal, the unity of the Church had been

maintained and this had been a source of strength during its long struggle against the Islamic assault upon and penetration of the *Respublic Christiana*. Indeed western Europe had striven long to uphold the Roman tradition of unity through the Holy Roman Empire and the Holy Roman Papacy; and even if the former had been somewhat of a kingdom of fairies, the Roman Church had been a closely knit and thoroughly integrated monarchy. Now this unity was for ever shattered. Henceforth whatever benefits Christianity might confer upon the nations professing its faith, unity was not one of them. Indeed it has to be sorrowfully confessed that, as has been demonstrated more particularly during the century of its greatest missionary expansion, the nineteenth, Christianity has operated as a divisive force thanks to its confessional divisions and rivalries; and this during an epoch when the world has become increasingly aware of the need for unity alike in temporal and spiritual concerns. Moreover the Protestant reformation has proliferated into an ever-increasing number of sects, of which the most thoroughgoing examples are to be found in the United States of America; and though this process may have been congenial to centuries which adopted the maxim of *laisser faire* and rejoiced in the healthy vigour produced by ecclesiastical competition, it has been realized to be the greatest single drawback to the good estate of Christianity in an age when the future of spiritual religion of every kind is threatened by the emergence of the totalitarian state with its this-wordly ideology and its persecution of all who in the name of God challenge the omnipotence of Caesar. Equally naturally the fraction of the medieval unity of the Church has driven the several rival denominations into reciprocal narrowness and rigidity. When the Church of Rome finally took in hand the internal reform of its own doctrine and discipline, the decrees of the Council of Trent in the former sphere were directed towards a tighter definition of points of theological interpretation, which before had been susceptible of a variety of construction, and a hardening of the differences dividing it from the Protestants. In return the several rebellious Churches developed a rival Protestant scholasticism, which succumbed likewise to the temptation to overdefinition and rigidity as evidenced by their confessional statements. Nor were the points of disagreement confined to those dividing Giant Pope from New Presbyter. If the Colloquy of Ratisbon between Lutherans and Romanists failed to achieve agreement on the doctrine of the Eucharist, so likewise did that of Marburg in 1529 between Luther and Zwingli, so that Wittenberg and Zurich remained in opposition on this issue, and not even the skilful mediatizing position of Calvin succeeded in

reconciling the differences. For all the Reformers inherited the medieval scholastics' conception of Theology as the Queen of the Sciences, and as such, moreover, possessing the qualities of an exact science; and few theologians of that age adopted the comprehensive position of the Anglican Hooker in contending for the practicability of an agreement to differ; whereby Churches might be willing mutually to tolerate differences of interpretation of the precise means by which grace was mediated to the believer through the Eucharist.

It would be entirely erroneous, however, to suppose that the Reformation was predominantly loss and not gain; for though the fragmentation of Christian corporate life and experience had an element of indubitable loss, it liberated new forces in individual Christian experience and fashioned new moulds of ecclesiastical polity and liturgy. Medieval religion had been essentially sacramental and the Christian life had been nourished by the reception of divine grace mediated through the several and respective sacraments. Aquinas, indeed, had drawn a close parallel between the processes of spiritual and physical life. As birth introduced the individual into temporal society, so baptism made him a member of the Church; as his physical life attained its natural fullness and he passed from youth to maturity, so confirmation registered and equipped him for full membership of the spiritual society; marriage represented a further stage in his participation in the structure of temporal society and was therefore given a sacramental character by the Church; just as medicine was given to heal his physical sickness so the sacrament of penance ministered to diseases of the soul, and when his malady was beyond human relief, unction prepared him for the final journey into eternity, and the rites of burial committed his body to the earth from whence it sprang, and his soul to the mercies of his Creator and Redeemer. Moreover just as temporal societies recruited new members by natural reproduction, so the Church by holy order maintained its spiritual ministry. From cradle to grave, therefore, medieval man was attended and encompassed by the sacraments of the Church; of which, however, the Mass was *facile princeps*. For in it there was not only given the sacramental body and blood of Christ to be received by the worthy participant, but also a propitiatory sacrifice was offered for the sins alike of the dead and of the living. The supreme duty of the Christian, therefore, was to assist at the offering of the Mass and, even though infrequently and probably only once per year, to communicate in the sacrament. Preaching, indeed, was popularized by the friars and played its part in medieval religious exercises; but it was secondary to the sacramental system and especially to the Mass.

Against this entire sacramental system and the theology of grace underlying it, the Reformation in differing degrees and in its various expressions was a vehement protest. The reformers, though with considerable divergence of emphasis and interpretation, all denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which had been defined by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1214 as the orthodox interpretation of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist; and therewith more particularly all rejected the conception of the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice offered for the sins of the quick and the dead. No explanation of the meaning and effects of the reforming movements can approach adequacy which does not reckon fully with their revulsion from the medieval doctrine of the Mass. The views of the leading reformers, and by consequence of the Churches stemming from their work, differed widely as to alternative interpretations; from Luther's doctrine of Consubstantiation to Zwingli's conception of sacraments as *nuda signa*, not even exhibiting much less conveying grace; with Calvin occupying a mediatizing position and the Anglican Book of Common Prayer permitting a considerable diversity of belief between the two excluded extremes of Transubstantiation and *nuda signa*. But all concurred in repudiating any idea of a propitiatory sacrifice. Thus the general result of the 'new theology' of the reformers and of its liturgical expressions, was a significant change in the character and nature of public worship in the reformed churches. It had, indeed, been an avowed purpose of their reforms to knit together indissolubly the Word and the Sacraments by providing that a sermon should always accompany the celebration of the Eucharist, as it was also their desire to turn the Mass into a Communion. Accordingly the ideal of Luther, Calvin and Cranmer alike was that of a weekly corporate parochial Communion with sermon. But the conservatism of the laity in each case refused the revolutionary advance from a yearly to a weekly communion; with the result that the usual order of Divine Service in the Churches affected by the Reformation was one of Scripture-reading, singing of psalms or hymns, offering of public prayer, whether according to a fixed liturgy or by extemporisation, crowned by a sermon or exposition of Scripture, and perhaps followed by the Ante-Communion; whilst the actual celebration of the Sacrament became a monthly or even quarterly exercise. This, though not the design of the leading reformers, succeeded in establishing itself as the custom of their Churches; and it contained, moreover, positive elements of great value in the corporate religious life of the Church. In the first place it accorded a clear primacy to Scripture; the reading

of which, both of the Old and New Testaments, in divine worship in the vernacular was a most influential factor in fashioning a new ideal of Christian devotion. For wherever the reformers' writ ran, translations of the whole Bible into the popular tongue were published; and shortly the Geneva Bible provided a version of the Scriptures suitable for private and family reading. From the public worship of the corporate Church down to individual piety as practised in the home, the Bible came to occupy the central place; and soon Puritanism became the dominant version of Protestantism. As a necessary corollary of these changes the vulgar tongue became the medium in which all the public services of the reformed Churches were conducted. No emphasis is necessary to point out the revolutionary character of this innovation, and the impetus thus given to that individualism in religion, which was foreshadowed in some developments of the later middle ages, especially the *devotio moderna*. 'The Bible, I say, the Bible only is the religion of Protestants': the aphorism of Chillingworth is well-known and expressed one of the most important and influential characteristics of the reformation. Consequently the sacraments fell into a secondary position. Indeed, the reformed Churches generally recognised only two Sacraments, those of Baptism and the Eucharist which the Gospels recorded as having been directly instituted by Christ himself; whilst the five other sacraments of the medieval Church were either rejected out-right or fell into general desuetude and neglect. Moreover an essential concomitant of the supremacy of Scripture was the prominence of the sermon, as expounding, explaining and applying the Word of God in Protestant worship.

Behind these changes there lay a corresponding change of emphasis, if not more, in the theology of grace. Justification by faith, *sola fide*, was the watchword of the Lutheran reformation, and was common, indeed, to all the reformed traditions being 'a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort' to the authors of Article XI. It would be impertinent to offer any interpretation of the meaning and scope of this doctrine when two resident Cambridge scholars, Dr. Gordon Rupp and Dr. Philip Watson, have expounded it with authority; and have been more recently reinforced by a Cambridge voice, *e partibus infidelium* as it were, in the person of Dr. J. S. Whale. It is perhaps not without significance, however, that the two first-named scholars belong to the Methodist tradition, for the Fifth Sermon of the *Forty-Four Sermons* of John Wesley, on *Justification by Faith*, makes plain that doctrine in limpid English so that he who runs may read. With this there went an accentuated emphasis on

divine predestination, whereby it was held that before the foundations of the world were laid, God had elected some members of the human race to salvation and had fortified them with grace in such wise that His purpose could not finally fail of fulfilment; though the ground of their election, as of man's justification, lay not in any merits which they might have acquired or be capable of acquiring, but in the free choice of God. To this doctrine of predestination and election, so 'full of sweet, pleasant and unspeakable comfort to godly persons (as the XVII Anglican Article avows), Calvin added the darker complement of the decree of reprobation; according to which the inscrutable Will of God had likewise consigned to damnation other members of fallen humanity, to whom no grace could be given efficacious to deliver them from this dread fate. Thus the grace mediated by preaching of the Word and administration of the sacraments could avail only for the elect; and the true, that is, the invisible Church consisted of the elect, of those predestined to be saved; of which concept indeed there had been evident foreshadowing in the teaching of Wyclif; though the visible Church might indeed embrace also some not so chosen. From these new theological doctrines a new conception of the Church resulted.

Perhaps, however, the most significant feature of Reformation ecclesiology was the authority and status accorded to the laity. To the medieval Christian a *churchman* was a cleric; and the persistence of this identification is exemplified in Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* where the clown jests with Viola by informing her that he is a churchman 'because I live by the Church'. Indeed, this conception of the incompetence of the laity in all matters concerning the faith, worship and discipline of the Church, voiced formally by the Convocation of Canterbury in the first year of Elizabeth I, survived long beyond the sixteenth century; as may be seen from a letter of April 25, 1867, addressed by Monsignor Talbot from Rome to Manning at Westminster: 'What is the province of the laity? To hunt, to shoot, to entertain. These matters they understand, but to meddle with ecclesiastical matters they have no right at all'. *Per contra*, the Reformation asserted emphatically and explicitly the rights of the laity, though in different forms and varying ways. It was a constant warning of Figgis that the Reformation could not be understood apart from full recognition of this characteristic. 'Starting from the doctrine that there was only one source of power, because there was only one society, the canonist party had concentrated final authority in the pope as supreme head. Erastus—and his position is very little different from that of all divines of the Reformation—con-

centrated it in the prince, as sovereign by divine right, the wielder of the sword of justice, with power immediately from God, and neither from pope, nor clergy, nor people. Thus it is the lay power which is ultimately supreme in the Reformation theory. . . . The ancient theory of the Church derived from the Christianized Empire of Justinian was this—the Emperor was an officer in the Church and his duty was not only to defend it but to see that its canons were obeyed. . . . This was expanded by divines in England and the Continent into the theory of the godly prince, *most religious* by his office, with the Lords of his Council, whose task is to administer justice and to maintain truth'. Dr. Ullman's recent studies have established the process by which the canonists asserted the *plenitudo potestatis* of the pope in reaction against the imperial claims, derived from the post-Constantinian epoch; and the Reformers went back to the Christian Roman Empire for historical precedents for the claims made for the sixteenth-century Christian prince against papal pretensions. But there was more in their argument than even these venerable historical precedents. The Reformers made their appeal to the Bible, in this as in other spheres; and believed themselves to have found there in the pattern of the Old Testament Kings of Israel and Judah the prototype of the godly prince of the New Covenant, 'over all persons and in all causes within his dominions supreme'. The exaltation of the godly prince was particularly noticeable in the Lutheran kingdoms of Denmark and Sweden, among the Lutheran princes of the Empire and in the English reformation; and whether conceived, as Figgis remarked, as sovereigns by divine right with power immediately from God, or as deriving power from the whole people, as Hooker in certain passages clearly implied, they represented the laity and their rights in the Church. The further development of this vogue of the godly prince into the territorial principle *cujus regio ejus religio*, with some of its anomalous consequences, was also one of the characteristic features of the Reformation. Not without reason did Thomas Cromwell issue an (admittedly bowdlerised) edition of Marsilius' *Defensor Pacis* in 1535 for the instruction of Englishmen. So too, until the formation of the German Empire in 1871, the king of Prussia within his own dominions was *summus episcopus*, though the title is to be interpreted as equivalent to that of Constantine the Great as *externus episcopus*. Calvin likewise held that, next to the ministry, the civil magistracy was the most important office to which a faithful Christian could be called.

But the assertion of the rights of the laity in the Church did not stop short with a proclamation of royal supremacy. The powers

exercised by the godly prince might be shared by his council or parliament. Even in England at the accession of Elizabeth I, whereas the clerical Convocation of Canterbury passed a series of resolutions, one of which formally denied the competence of the laity to interfere in matters concerning the faith, worship and discipline of the Church, the Parliament proceeded, notwithstanding, to debate the acts of supremacy and uniformity; and the researches of Sir John Neale have shown that the Elizabethan Prayer Book was forced upon a reluctant sovereign by a resolute House of Commons. The precedent thus set was to be fruitful subsequently; whilst in the Reformed Churches the laity played an important part at every stage of ecclesiastical polity, beginning with the local elders chosen to co-operate with the presbyterate in the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline and culminating in their representation in the General or National Assembly. From the Calvinist system the principle was taken over and extended more widely by the Independents and Separatists; so that Henry Barrow could declare that 'we hold all true believers, ecclesiastical and spiritual', and again, 'we know not what you mean by your old popish term of laymen'. Indeed, it may be claimed that ecclesiastical or spiritual democracy had been not only proclaimed, but realized in these Independent Churches; where the conception of the Church was that of a gathered society of the elect; 'The Church planted or gathered, is a company or number of believers, which by a willing covenant made with their God, are under the government of God and Christ and keep His laws in one holy communion'; or again, 'The true planted and rightly established Church of Christ is a company of faithful people—separated from the unbelievers and heathen of the land—gathered in the name of Christ'. Accordingly in the gathered Church the election and ordination of a pastor was by the 'holy and free elections of the Lord's holy and free people', so that 'hath everyone of the people interest in the election and ordination of their officers'. The expression of the democratic principle went even further; for the right of every believer to give utterance to what the Spirit said to him was carefully safeguarded. 'In this Church is the heavenly harmony of the exercise of prophecy, where the variety and diversity of God's gifts and graces to his saints are manifested, according to the gifts and abilities that God hath given unto them to the mutual edification, exhortation and comfort one of another and the rest of the body . . . which exercise of prophecy is the first ordinance that the Lord commanded and commended in His Church, under the gospel, exhorting all His saints to the same, as the most special and excellent gift, yea and most needful at all

times'. It followed from this conception of the Church, moreover, that the civil magistrates, from the sovereign down to the local justice of the peace, had no authority whatever in matters of religion and no supremacy over or in the Church. Indeed, unless the civil magistrate as an individual believer were a member of the Church, he had no place in it; and even as a member, he enjoyed no rights or privileges above his fellow-believers. When, furthermore, Henry Barrow, John Greenwood and John Penry in England suffered martyrdom for their defiance of the state, they gave the answer in advance to Hobbes and to Hitler, by asserting the absolute sovereignty of the Kingdom or Church of Christ. It was natural that these sectaries, because of their doctrines of the nature of the Church and of its complete independence from the control of the state, should be persecuted by the godly princes of the sixteenth century; for they had laid the axe to the root of the tree of that marriage of nationalism with Protestantism which had seemed the precondition of the success of the Reformation.

The appeal to the Spirit not only as the Guide and Interpreter of the Scriptures, but also as the Inner Light directing the individual believer, indeed, led to difficult consequences for Protestantism. On the continent the Anabaptists were the bugbear of all the conservative Reformers; and in England the more extreme sectaries claimed the guidance of the Spirit for the ministry of women, or for the rejection of even the two generally recognized Dominical sacraments. Moreover they were impervious both to the practical commonsense of Cromwell that God 'speaks without a written word sometimes yet according to it', and to the authoritative opinion of Baxter that 'He never says anything by His Spirit to the hearts of men repugnant to what the same Spirit hath said in His Word.' Not, indeed, that this emphasis on the Spirit was a legacy of Protestantism alone. Monsignor Knox has shown its recurrence in the history of Christendom both before and after the Reformation, and notably within the post-Tridentine Roman Church. But the principles of the priesthood of all believers and of private judgment in Protestantism undoubtedly encouraged and gave wider scope to this appeal to the Spirit. Nor should it be forgotten that it is to Separatism that English Christianity owes one of the greatest literary masterpieces of its history and of our language, the *Pilgrim's Progress* of the Baptist preacher John Bunyan, to which the Protestant tradition might almost appeal for its justification without calling its many other and various witnesses.

For the new dignity of the laity in the Reformation tradition

found expression outside purely ecclesiastical circles. The conception of calling and vocation, which the medieval Church had applied specifically to the clergy and especially to the religious life, was extended and applied to secular professions. The ordinary life of the faithful churchman, alike in the domestic circle of his family and in his professional functions, came within the ambit of divine election and grace; so that diligence and industry in the exercise of that calling became a sign and mark of the righteous man. Moreover the ideal of family piety, whereby the head of an house read the Scriptures to his family on the Lord's Day and perhaps rehearsed the chief points of the sermon in Church, took a new importance and expression in the Protestant Churches. Similarly there was something peculiar to the genius of the Anglican reformation in the portrayal of the country priest in George Herbert's *The Priest to the Temple.* Nor can any reader of the parliamentary debates of the turbulent seventeenth century fail to be struck by their similarity to sermons; not less in their language borrowed from the Authorized Version of the Bible than in the content of their argument from the divine pattern of government and society laid down for the chosen people in the Old and developed under the New Covenants. Not only did the English people, in the famous phrase of J. R. Green, become the people of a book, and that book the Bible; but the Bible itself became a kind of Outline of Knowledge for Boys and Girls and their Parents, in cosmology and history no less than theology.

It was, therefore, upon the Churches of the Reformation tradition that the force of the movement of higher and lower criticism of the Bible fell with devastating vigour in the nineteenth century. Even more startling than the challenge and the conflict of science with religion, as geology, anthropology and biology proceeded to demolish the traditional stories of the creation of the universe, of the several species of animal creation and of mankind contained in *Genesis*, was the *boulversement* of traditional conceptions of the historicity, authorship and date of several books of the Old and New Testaments. The denial of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and still more the contention that the Law was much later in date than the Prophets; the relegation of some of the Psalms to the post-Exilic and Maccabean ages were sufficiently startling in themselves; and became more alarming when it was realized that they involved serious problems of Christology, since Jesus was reported by the evangelists as having referred to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the Davidic of the Psalter and having thereby authenticated these traditional tran-

scriptions, now challenged by criticism. But if the ark of the Old Covenant seem to be staggering under such blows, worse was to befall the New Testament; as the questions of date, authorship and historicity of the four Gospels and of the corpus of Pauline Epistles were scrutinized, contested or challenged. Towards this movement of literary and historical criticism of the Bible, the Church of Rome, indeed, maintained an attitude of proud defiance and indifference; and, fortified by the authority which it attached to ecclesiastical tradition, it even added to the dogmas *de fide* the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. Amongst Churches of the Reformation tradition, however, there were inevitably many incidental, and some severe, casualties in the process of adjusting accepted beliefs to the new methods and conclusions of critical study. It is probably the greatest single achievement of the Protestant tradition, whose principle had been crystallized in Chillingworth's dictum that 'the Bible, the Bible only is the religion of Protestants', to have grappled successfully with this revolution in the methods and results of Biblical study; and to have reconstructed the fundamentals of Christian faith upon a new but also more secure basis of careful and devout scholarship.

In this, and in many other outstanding respects, the four centuries since the Reformation have seen the legacy of Protestantism suffer profound changes. The influence of the godly prince has now almost entirely vanished and even the established national Church is an unusual, if not also anachronistic, feature of contemporary Christendom. The several Protestant Churches have learned to stand on their own feet and to rely on their own resources, alike in matters spiritual and material. This development has been even more marked in their external relations than in internal organization. For the great Protestant missionary expansion of the nineteenth century differed from such earlier epochs of Christian extension as the sixteenth, seventeen and eighteenth centuries, by being entirely the work of the several Churches, and particularly of their individual members both laity and ministers, and not a following of the imperial expansion of their several states. No longer was the Gospel carried with the flag; rather the ideal and policy of the western Churches was to establish their converts so soon as possible on an independent basis with an indigenous ministry, so that they might be able to withstand the changes and chances of political fortune by their own inherent strength. The wisdom of this policy has been abundantly proved in the present century, when nationalistic sentiment in the far east has sought to sweep away occidental missionary influences and to compel the native Churches to stand alone and bide the pelting of the pitiless totalitarian storm.

But, although the form of the Protestant legacy has changed radically, its essential content remains the same. The principles of the absolute authority of the Bible as the foundation of Christian faith and praxis, of the performance of divine worship in a language understanded of the people, of the priesthood of all believers (of which the professional ministry is representative), of the rights of the laity in the Church, of the unity of the Word and the Sacraments, and of Justification by Faith : these remain as the positive and permanent legacy of the Reformation. Meantime, the emergence of the modern totalitarian state, with its tremendous powers of indoctrination through its monopoly of education and of such agencies as broadcasting, and with its own this-wordly ideology, has presented the legatees of the Reformation with novel and formidable problems. To these they have essayed to reply by the bold attempt during the present half-century to reverse the fissiparous tendencies which had characterized the history of Protestantism and had formed the basis of Bossuet's polemic against it; and by such practical successes as the Oecumenical Movement, the foundation of the World Council of Churches (representing all the non-Roman Churches) and by the local experiment in reunion of the Church of South India. It seems even now safe to prophesy that these developments will constitute the most important and influential events in the Church history of the twentieth century. Moreover it should be recognized that they represent the ideal of unity through diversity, not of uniformity; that they rest upon agreement in matters fundamental to Christian faith and upon agreement to differ in non-essentials; and that they seek to incorporate in the inheritance of 'the Coming Great Church' the manifold riches of God. The phrase in the Epistle to the Ephesians, *πολυποίκιλος σοφία*, indeed, is the characteristic feature of the legacy of the Reformation as fashioned in the present age; for it is by the many-coloured wisdom of God that it seeks to knit together again the riven fragments of the seamless robe of Christ. And forasmuch as all traditions, whether religious or secular, ecclesiastical or civil, spiritual or temporal, may legitimately claim to be judged by their ideals; so the legacy of the Reformation may be tested by its fidelity, always in aspiration and in varying degree in actuality, to the vision of a New Covenant set forth by a writer of the Old, wherein 'this is the covenant that I will make with the House of Israel after those days, saith the Lord : I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart I will write it; . . . and they shall teach no more every man his neighbour and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord'.

# THE LOVEABLENESS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By the Reverend KENNETH HENDERSON, M.A., B.Litt., Hon. Th.D.
Federal Supervisor of Religious Broadcasts: Australian Broadcasting Commission

'You know, cricket is a very Anglican game,' I remarked to a friend on the Sydney Cricket Ground, as we watched the dignified rhythm of a 'Test'. 'Cricket is very like the Church of England. It has grace and beauty, and played in its own character, it has good manners and generosity of heart. Its true exponents play the game with graciousness and power.'

'Yes,' said my friend, 'very Anglican. It doesn't even guarantee a day's exercise. And while it is played by a team of individuals, it is as little of a team game as any game can be that is played by a team. And when not played according to its proper spirit, one turns from it in weariness and vexation of heart.'

'Or holds on, held up with hope for a turn for the better,' I replied.

'They could both do with some altering of their laws and a good shake-up,' he said. 'But here, I admit, the ways diverge. Cricket persists in insisting that it's perfect, but I grant you *Ecclesia Anglicana* among churches has the grace to admit she's far from it.'

'Remember T. S. Eliot,' I said. 'The Church of England washes its dirty linen in public, but it does get washed.'

'I suppose it does,' he said. 'But it often takes a long time coming home from the laundry. But I refuse further to discuss ecclesiology in the cross-talk of Mr. Bones.'

This article started up within me, however, not to the lazy rhythm of an afternoon's cricket, but at the hearing of one bitter sentence thrown across a dinner table, a sentence which declared war to the knife in the Church of England between the speaker's group—people concentrating on salvation and holding the substitutionary theory of the Atonement, according to which Christ took on Himself the punishment of our sins, and those whom he called sacramentalists, and accused of a materialized and mechanized conception of the Incarnation. At the time, I felt that it was not so much the over-simplified parodying of two types of religious experience, as the bitterness in the tone that contradicted the nature of the Church of England.

Here is a Church uniquely important in Christendom because it is trying to maintain within itself tensions, one end of which has

been let go by Rome, and the other by the Protestant groups; a Church trying to impress many-sided truth, rich and various, on men coined small—many of them. These people, who persist in remaining little in face of the generous possibilities, regard *Ecclesia Anglicana* as the unfinished opportunity for finalizing the victory of their parties by throwing overboard those of other minds.

Our history has been a weaving together of diverse strands of religious experience, and an acceptance of antitheses such as no other Church in Christendom has attempted. I believe it is that acceptance of strains and diversities which indicates our special destiny in Christendom wherever we are, and offers a way whereby Christendom may recover its richness of life. The truth, living and moving truth, is in discourse between inner life and outward service, faith and works, austerity and beauty, between sanity of tradition and personal freedom to experience and discover, between private and corporate life. All are there talking to one another.

The Church of England is a unique attempt at establishing intercourse between varieties of religious experience, and the success of this adventure is still in the balance. If we can win our own battle by maintaining our characteristic 'agony', we shall win a great victory for the integrity of man's spirit. Men are coined small, as Plato said, and this attempt to live with other kinds of little people exposes us to that danger thus described:

> 'Another of our human weaknesses is to expect our own experience of God to be reproduced in identical terms in the experience of another. Worse than this, we sometimes tend to think that if another's experience is not the same as ours, it must be either spurious or incomplete. Now, here we must be very firm with ourselves and use our commonsense as well as our charity.'

The greatest thing that I have read on the texture of religious experience, and its weaving, is von Hügel's introduction to his *Mystical Element in Religion.*' Von Hügel was a liberal Roman Catholic whose influence was chiefly among Anglicans and Nonconformists and Jews. He says that there are three basic elements —vitamins, he might have said—in all healthy religious experience. To be spiritually fit we must have all three, but one will always come out on top. These three necessary elements may be most clearly seen, he affirms, in the three historic parties of the Church of England.

The Evangelical quality has thus been described by the Bishop of Grafton, Australia, the Right Reverend C. E. Storrs, in his diocescan charge, 1953.

'There is an intense belief in God, and in the saving power of the Christian gospel; in the value of each human soul and in the awful choice which each of us must make, and in the utter necessity of personal conviction. Here we find a conviction of the true faith without slavish dependence on forms and ceremonies; of the right of immediate access to our Saviour, the one Mediator between God and Man; and of our utter dependence, not on our works or merits, but on His grace, for God has provided us with free deliverance in the atoning death of Christ, if only we will acknowledge our sin and accept that reconcilation.'

'And with this there goes great moral earnestness, a strict ordering of life, a study and re-study of the Bible as the Word of God to you and me to-day, and free and unselfconscious outpouring of prayer whether in public or private; a consecration of Sunday as a day holy and apart, and yet of every weekday too, through the custom of family prayers, and with it all a sense of urgency, the pressure of time passing all too quickly with eternity just round the corner; the call to evangelise, rescue from sin that man and woman and with it all—in the finest Evangelicals—a sense of peace. God knows, God will provide, God is sufficient.'

Then the bishop distinguishes the catholic strand, 'which, its exponents say, is the completion of the evangelical.'

'First and foremost there is, then, this sense of membership in the apostolic universal Church; the assurance that though we are called and saved as individuals, one by one, we are called and saved into a community not fashioned by men as a perhaps happier and more convenient way of living, we are called and saved into a community fashioned by God himself, to be the body of Christ on earth, the living body, the mind, the heart and hands of Christ with Himself as our Head. The Church then must, in a real sense be separate, distinct from the world, not fettered by subservience to the State, not influenced by vested interests in wealth and political partisanship. The Church must have its soul and voice and hands free and unencumbered for vigorous witness and action on behalf of Christ and His Kingdom.'

With this sturdy faith in the Church as the organ of the spirit and as the fulfilment of the individual, there goes a high valuing of the tradition of the Church, of the continuity of its way and life, of its threefold apostolic ministry, its worship and its sacraments.

'To the Catholic outlook all these are designed not to be screens that come between a man and his Maker, but as helps, as means of grace, persons ordained to bring men nearer to the Lord reconciled and strengthened, and certain sacramental ways and times by which our human vision can be enlightened and one human weakness reassured and strengthened.'

'The Catholic outlook in our Church of England does not turn its back on the Reformation nor cease its protest against unwarranted claims of infallibility, against later accretions added to the original and Biblical faith of the Church, and against certain teachings which seem to us unwarranted by scripture and demoralising to the purity of the faith, against the claims to know what God has left unrevealed, and to have powers (which seem to us presumptuous) in matters which God has left in His own merciful hands.'

Before examining the third element — Liberal, or Broad Church or 'Modernist'—let us look briefly at the clash between these first two, Catholic and Evangelical.

The Roman Catholic Church has always exerted a powerful two-way influence on the Church of England, either as attraction or repulsion. To those in the Reformation Tradition, it is evident that whatever Rome does, the opposite must be done. If Roman Churches are open on weekdays, then Protestant churches must be locked; if Communion is frequent in the Roman Church, it must be infrequent for the Protestant. Because Rome uses elaborate symbolism, for Protestantism there must not be any; because Rome says masses for the dead, Protestants may not call upon God's love for their dead at all. And in extreme Anglo-Catholic circles, there is equally uncritical imitativeness in thought and worship—'lushness' of ritual and devotion, a hospitality to the non-scriptural developments of Roman doctrine that quite rejects the rational, moral and historical temper of criticism released by the Reformation. The fact that the Church of England has never succeeded in building up an effective system of discipline, has given these two opposing Roman-derived tendencies—to imitation and repulsion—their heads, for what these heads are worth. This lack of central discipline imposes on every faithful Anglican a responsibility to be sane.

After 400 years rich in experience and diversity, the time has surely come when *Ecclesia Anglicana* can work towards an adult personality, able to take matters of doctrine, ritual and devotional practice on their merits. We can believe in the objective and real presence of Christ to the communicant, without the mediaeval doctrine of transubstantiation. In the Eucharistic Sacrifice we can joyfully commemorate and lay before God Christ's life and sacrifice without believing in a fresh atonement every time the priest celebrates.

We can use the bible with understanding reverence when we discern the spirit overcoming limitation and error therein.

We can throw open the ministry of confession and absolution to all who need it, as most of us, I believe, do, while guarding against triviality and the dangers of routine.

We are not suggesting to people that they should screw up courage to tell Mr. Jones when they do 'something awful', but confess to and receive forgiveness from Christ through His Church for their daily failures in love and service. So-called 'modernism' is the attempt to see Christian truth in the Christian story through the sharpened eyes of this generation. The spirit of informed and reverent criticism acts as a form of revelation sifting

truth and protecting against the extravagance that makes for spiritual ill-health and the running away from questions that we call obscurantism.

There is no contradiction between living by justification through faith and daily experience of God in private prayer on the one hand, and, on the other hand, meeting the living God in sacraments and the corporate life of the Church. For sacraments and Church would be lifeless except as the personal enjoyment of God's ministering love invoked. There is rest in the Lord in the intelligent use of sacraments as there is a danger of formalism. Personal devotion works through self-made forms and these may become too subjective, shapeless and strained, unless they have help from liturgy and sacrament.

Along with these new worlds of fact, Christian interests have widened and diversified and these interests wait to be translated into prayer. Before us lies the task of helping people to pray in the speech they use commonly about the concerns that worry them.

All this criticism and creative thinking has created a considerable tension between the people who are doing it, and the people who think more slowly, who refuse to acknowledge the twentieth century's right to ask questions and who regard all questions and needs as answered by the old ways.

There have been casualties, as there always have been among Christians who commit themselves to new forms of warfare. Some of the modernists lost their balance and succumbed to unrestrained reaction from the tendencies and errors they were fighting. Loisy, for example. Some were tried for their ecclesiastical lives. But the Privy Council and Randall Davidson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, during a critical time kept open every doubtful issue. It was said that in the nineteenth century the Church of England was saved from obscurantism because her formularies were interpreted by slightly cynical lawyers. Those were the days when the Gorham Judgement was said 'to have dismissed hell with costs and deprived members of the Church of England of their last hope of everlasting damnation'. Bishop Colenso of Natal was prosecuted. Frederick Denison Maurice last his post in King's College, London University, for denying everlasting punishment.

Much indignation was roused when Frederick Temple, Charles Gore, and Hensley Henson were made bishops. W. R. Inge and B. H. Streeter, if they had lived in Australia, would have lived their working lives in the A.B.C. Still, in the Church of England we have begun the task of creative honesty in the working intercourse of faith and knowledge, and we have met God in the undertaking.

*Ecclesia Anglcana* is what she is because she everywhere more or less accepts the tension between her three parties, and more or less recognises what each has to do for the whole. It is for her true sons to transform those tensions into conversations. For, as we affirmed, these three parties represent three vitamins that we all need. We all need to belong to all of them.

This is not just personal preaching. History intended our Church for creative conversation. In the Elizabethan Settlement, the Church of England took on its present personality. If it was meant to be wholly Protestant, in the ordinary sense of the word, why did it retain so much of Catholicism in the ordinary sense—its orders and their continuity, its ordinal and occasional offices, its creeds and so very much of its liturgy and daily worship? On the other hand, if it was meant to be wholly Catholic in the traditional sense, and reformed only in the sense of having certain abuses cut off, why the Articles, and such deep and drastic changes in its policy, worship and expressions of belief?

# SOLEMNIZING THE LAW*

By Professor Alaric Rose

St. Mathew v, 17. 'Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets : I came not to destroy but to fulfil.

IN a recently published philosophical work the writer held that there is no distinction in kind between the rules of tennis and what is commonly called the law of the land. It was surprising that he went on to favour 'solemnizing' the law of the land in some way. He did not explain what he meant by solemnising, but probably the analogy is with a marriage : you can either be legally married in a register office or you can have the marriage solemnized in church to impress on all concerned its importance. It seems likely that an Assizes Service comes under this heading.

It is not difficult to appreciate this desire. For it is recognized by all men of good will that our Commonwealth laws and courts are a very great blessing, especially at a time of social upheaval and shaking of old-established moral foundations both in East and West. But traditional concepts of law itself, upon which rested some of the respect accorded to the law, have themselves been undergoing criticism and change. Traditionally, law has often been reverenced as of divine origin. The Israelites looked to a theophany in Sinai as the origin of their law, indeed, in the later phase law was their religion. For Plato, law is eternal Reason incarnate, and in the *Politicus* the laws are treated as the deputy for the divine Ruler in his absence, second best only to his personal rule, like the prescription the doctor leaves for guidance until he returns. The Romans looked to the Stoic conception of natural law as proceeding alike from the Providential rule of the world and man's rational nature—one universal objective law to which all man-made laws must approximate to claim the name of law. The New Testament itself bears witness to reverence for established law as a mysterious instrument of God's will even when unworthily administered; St. John represents Jesus as saying that the judicial powers which Pilate has over him are 'from above'. Compare with this estimate of law the present position. The modern concept of nature as developing has put natural law in dock, flawed by a serious ambiguity. The scientific concept of law as statistical averages is not helpful, indeed, it is inclined to be a snare, since some mistakenly suppose that statistics drawn from sociology and psychology can somehow themselves furnish

* *Preached at the Opening of the Assizes in St. John's Cathedral, Hong Kong, January 9th,* 1956.

moral or legal prescriptions. Theories of Civil law favour treating its origin solely in the enactments of national sovereign bodies. In the most recent edition of John Austin's 'Province of Jurisprudence Determined', the editor commends Austin for separating law from religion and morality, and for making clear the conventional nature of law. The writer I have quoted holds that there is no difference in kind between the rules of tennis and the rules which we call the law of the land. As a layman myself, I can only mention the muddled views about law which came to the surface when this Colony was occupied by the Japanese. Some held that thereupon allegiance was owed to nothing but Japanese law; others that we could do anything we liked provided we could get away with it. One section of the interned community accepted the view that private property was abolished on December 25, and acted accordingly; another section apparently believed that the ten commandments could be revoked seriatim by majority vote. Faced with these considerations it is not hard to echo the sentiments of the Psalmist even if his faith is not possible :

> For I remembered thine everlasting judgments, O Lord : and received comfort. I am horribly afraid : for the ungodly that forsake thy law.

What is recommended then is a solemnizing of the law. There are more ways than one of doing this, however, and solemnizing as such is not necessarily a benefit. It tends, for example, to cast a deep sleep upon the participants, to lull the critical faculty, and to induce indiscriminate conservatism, and it is by no means clear that this is a valuable attitude. For what could be more obnoxious than to bind round men's necks a human institution, imperfect and fallible like all human devices, using the claim that it is not less than divine? It cannot surely be proposed to solemnize as divine admittedly human laws. For it was just this which Christ so severely condemned among his contemporaries—that man-made laws had been invested with the sanctity of divine origin. For in his time the multitude of regulations and commentary had been accepted as of authority equal to the Decalogue and the five Books of the Law, and equally of divine origin with them. At this vice he directed his charge : 'Ye leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men. Full well do ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your tradition.' Where everything is spiritualized the spiritual is no longer valued. 'Ye tithe mint, and anise, and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, judgment and mercy and faith.' And we can see in Christ's handling of the law of marriage and divorce, for example, that he had to discard the omnibus solemnizing of

the national law of his time. God's law and Moses' law are sharply contrasted: God's purpose in creation was this kind of relationship between man and wife; Moses, for the hardness of men's hearts permitted a bill of divorcement, so that divorce is men's convention rooted in his imperfections, and does not cancel or abrogate God's creative purpose and its principles. Christ 'unsolemnized' a large amount of contemporary law, not by destroying, but by discriminating between God's laws and those of men. Some would say that Christ re-graded the laws, as when he graded duties: '. . . judgment, mercy, faith. These ye ought to have done and not to have left the other undone.' This may be so, but the re-grading was in the light of his knowledge of God as Creator and Ruler, the Beginning and the first Principle, the Source of goodness and justice. Further, we see Christ penetrating to the divine principle animating existing laws; for example, he said that on the two commandments to love God and neighbour 'hang all the law and the prophets'. He says 'hang', not 'are built up'; for there is another ingredient in law which does not spring from God but from sin: 'Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you? Take heed and keep yourselves from all covetousness'. We see him making decisions of moral principle which have to be made anew at critical periods in history: 'Is it lawful to do good or to do evil on the sabbath day?' For the question 'Who is my neighbour?' he substituted another: 'Who *proved* neighbour to him that fell among thieves?' He said: 'And if ye do good to them that do good to you, what credit is that to you, for even sinners do the same. Do good to them that hate you . . . and ye shall be sons of the Most High, for he is kind towards the unthankful and evil.' That is, society is not maintained by the self-interest and calculation of its members, but by their kindness and sacrifice. We hear him speaking of the moral and providential government of the world: 'Blessed are the peacemakers, Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness, Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake. Blessed are the merciful, the meek, and the poor,' which is describing what God is purposing and brings to pass.

Above all we see him ruling, in a way that was a surprise to most, but which his followers have decided is that of the divine Presence on earth. To come into this Presence and to draw from it, is the effective solemnization of the law which Plato represented as the Divine Ruler's deputy. It is a solemnizing which looses as well as binds, which is as a sharp sword in its discriminating, yet which ministers not destruction but fulfilment.

# THE ARCHAEOLOGIST AND THE PRESENT STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY

By W. H. C. Frend, D.Phil., F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S.

IN a recent lecture given to the congress marking the four hundredth anniversary of the Pontifical Gregorian Academy, Professor Enrico Josi, one of the directors of the excavations under St. Peter's, spoke of the contribution made by the archaeologist to the study of the history of the early Church.[1] As was to be expected, much of his talk was devoted to the Catacombs, to the support given by successive Popes to archaeological research and to advances in the understanding of early liturgical practices. The sheer bulk of the discoveries which he cited must, however, have impressed his audience that some thing new had been afoot in previous decades and that all Christian Communions had had their share in this development. The contribution of archaeology embraces nearly all aspects of the study of Church history, including the development of its mission, the background to its doctrines, and the growth of its liturgy. The implications are worth considering, for it may well be that the archaeologist will eventually face the theologian with greater problems than those raised by Biblical criticism in the last century. To some extent, the mantle of the Higher Critic has now descended on the archaeologist.

In this paper we shall first be discussing briefly some of these new archaeological discoveries and then considering their significance for the future study of Church history.[2] During the last twenty-five years the harvest has been immense. The discovery of forty-eight Gnostic works in a library of the Sethite sect at Nag-Hammadi near Luxor in 1946 has not only put into our possession works which may include those of Valentinus himself, but has thrown an entirely new light on the nature of Gnosticism.[3]

[1] Enrico Josi, 'Il Contributo dell' Archeologia cristiana alla Storia della Chiesa antica', *Analecta Gregoriana*, LXX, 1954, 3-17.

[2] The basis of this paper was a lecture given to a Theological conference held at St. Deiniol's, Hawarden, in June, 1953. Part has been reproduced in the *Church of England Newspaper* of July 22, 1955.

[3] Extracts of one codex of these documents have been studied by Professors H. C. Puech, G. Quispel and W. V. van Unnik and the results of their work presented to English readers by Professor F. L. Cross in *The Jung Codex*, Mowbrays, 1954. H. C. Puech's 'Les nouveaux Ecrits gnostiques découverts en Haute-Egypte', in *Coptic Studies presented in honour of Walter Ewing Crum*, Boston, 1950, 91-154, is still the most useful work on the collection as a whole.

It may be necessary to abandon Harnack's dictum of 'extreme Hellenisation'[4] in favour of an appreciation of the part played by Jewish mysticism in the development of these sects. In any event, the heretics now speak for themselves without the often distorted medium of the works of their orthodox opponents. A similar find in 1931 at Medinet Madi in the Fayum has resulted in knowledge of the original works of the arch-heretic Mani (A.D. 216-277) and of the liturgy of the Manichaean communities in fourth-century Egypt. Another accidental discovery, this time while digging a gun-pit south of Cairo in 1942, brought to light some lost works of Origen, and even more fascinating, of his disciple Didymus the Blind (flor. circa A.D. 350). Then, finally to crown everything, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Essene(?) monastery at Q'mran, are epoch-making discoveries which will influence permanently Biblical studies. These are the sensational chance finds, but of equally lasting value have been the systematic campaigns in the field such as those carried out by French archaeologists in Algeria and British and Turkish scholars in Anatolia. These have added greatly to our knowledge of the spread of Christianity and of its impact on the rural populations of the Roman provinces.

Some of the discoveries belong almost to the realm of science fiction. Take for instance the discovery of the Manichaean documents from Medinet Madi[5]. In 1930 the German historian and papyrologist, Professor Carl Schmidt was on a visit to Cairo. The trip was a normal one, entailing a round of calls on local dealers from whom he hoped to buy papyri for the Kaiser Friedrich Museum in Berlin. Schmidt was a busy man and had brought with him the proofs of the new edition of Epiphanios' great dossier of early heresies (the *Panarion*) which a friend was engaged in editing.

The night before a visit to a life-long acquaintance he happened to be working over his author's account of the Manichaeans. Apart from some texts found in Central Asia the literary remains of these heretics who for ten years had numbered St. Augustine among their adherents, had utterly perished. Nothing was known about their writings except from the descriptions of their enemies. But Epiphanios had mentioned a work he called the *Kephalaia* or Principles as one of the chief Manichaean books. Schmidt had just reached this place in the text and meant to carry on the next evening.[6]

[4] A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 1, 236 (E.T. 1, 229).

[5] Schmidt's description of the event is given in his paper, *Neue Originalquellen des Manichäismus aus Aegypten*, Stuttgart, 1933.

[6] Epiphanios, *Panarion* (ed. Holl), 66.2.9 (Holl. p. 18).

After the usual black coffee the dealer brought out for inspection what looked like a wad of thick, dry felt and put it on the counter. It seemed pretty hopeless, when Schmidt noticed that at any rate the Coptic lettering on the first sheet was remarkably well set out. He looked at the papyrus more closely, and then in the top right hand corner his eye lit on the word *Kephalaion*, and then the sentence, 'And again the Enlightener spoke to his disciples.' He had found an original Manichaean manuscript, the first ever discovered within the boundaries of the Roman Empire.

Eventually, seven complete works were recovered, which a native had originally found in a waterlogged chest in the rubble of a Roman house in a village in the Fayum and brought into Cairo. Here were not only some translations of the works of the arch-heretic Mani, but the hymns and psalms sung by his humble followers in Egypt. For the first time the impact of this sad religion of resignation and fatalism on the ordinary people in the Roman Empire was revealed. The importance for the study of the early history of the Church, not least for the background of the doctrine of St. Augustine, was immense.

Of the systematic campaigns with a specific object in view two may be quoted, the excavations beneath St. Peter's from 1940-1949, and the intensive work by French scholars in Algeria extending back to the eighteen-nineties, which resulted in a great increase in our knowledge of the native African civilisation associated with the Donatist schism. The Vatican excavations were surely one of the boldest efforts ever undertaken to solve a problem of Church history through archaeology[7]. Could St. Peter's resting place be determined or not? If it could, and if the bones of the Apostle could be proved to have been buried beneath the spot now marked by the high altar in St. Peter's, then part of the Petrine tradition would have been vindicated. The last wish of Pope Pius XI in 1939 to be buried as near as possible to the Confessio in St. Peter's led to excavations being begun under the Church immediately after his death.

His successor had listened with enthusiasm to Monsignor Duchesne's lectures on Christian archaeology when a young man, and with great courage and scholarly zeal had authorized the work in the area beneath the high altar. Towards the end of the

[7] The most useful estimates of the results of the excavations are J. M. C. Toynbee, 'The Shrine of St. Peter in its Historical Setting', *Journal of Roman Studies*, xliii, 1953, 1-26, J. Carcopino, *Etudes d'Histoire chrétienne*, 1953, 99, ff., O. Cullmann, *Petrus*, 1952, 73-169 (E.T. 1953, pp. 132 ff.). Also, Jocelyn Toynbee and John Ward Perkins, *The Shrine of St. Peter and the Vatican Excavations*, Longmans, 1956.

war my own duties with the Foreign Office brought me into contact with Vatican authorities, and I was privileged to see the work in progress and spend some hours in the excavations.

Conditions were extremely difficult. The foundations of the basilica built in honour of St. Peter by the Emperor Constantine impeded the alignment of trenches. The proper disposal of soil which had been examined seemed then to be an insoluble problem. This meant that the purely technical but vital task of establishing sections for dating was almost impossible. The result was a rather untidy dig and the consequent difficulty in assessing its results. As is well known an imposing pagan cemetery dominates the site. The lack of graffiti involving the Apostle and the absence of a datable Christian structure before circa A.D. 160[8] suggests that the place of St. Peter's burial has not been found. On the other hand, this spot may have been where Christians in the early third century A.D. themselves located it.

In Africa also, the problem was one of testing the truth of an existing literary tradition. A great deal was already known about the history of the North African Church from the writings of the African Fathers, Tertullian, Cyprian, Optatus of Milevis and Augustine. From the works of the two latter authors it was clear that the last century of Roman rule in North Africa had been one of religious stress and turmoil, that the vast majority of the natives rejected orthodox Catholicism, which they associated with economic oppression. They turned instead to a stern puritanical schism, which took its name from its first great leader, Donatus of Carthage. Here was the chance of finding out how the 'Donatists' lived, and perhaps why St. Augustine found them such intractable opponents.

This work was laborious. It involved a detailed survey of more than one hundred sites of Romano-Berber villages, sometimes approachable only by mule, followed by trial excavations[9]. On one occasion, I was told to go round a large group of ruins counting up the remains of olive presses which littered the ground. There was some method in this particular madness, as olives and barley were the principal crops grown by the natives in Roman times, and these presses provided a clue to the density of the population and its social structure.

[8] This lack is in marked contrast to the great number of third century invocations to SS. Peter and Paul which adorn the walls of the *Memoria* of the Apostles beneath the present church of San Sebastiano, cf. J. M. C. Toynbee, *op. cit.*, 13-14, and H. Last, *Journal of Roman Studies* xliv, 1954, 114. Also, Toynbee and Ward Perkins, *op. cit.*, 171.

[9] Described by André Berthier, *Les Vestiges du Christianisme antique dans la Numidie centrale*, Algiers, 1942.

On the whole, the work was surprisingly well-rewarded. We found that in the fourth and fifth centuries Christianity had been the universal religion of these Africans.[10] In some sites remains of no less than six churches were found. All these, too, contained the typical characteristics of the Donatist cult, such as the fervent veneration of 'martyrs' (mostly completely spurious), devotion to the Old Testament (shown by texts cut on the lintels of the doors), and sometimes even the watch-word *Deo Laudes*, which Augustine affirmed was more dreaded than the lion's roar[11]. Gradually a pattern emerged.

We were able to see how Donatism had swept through the native villages and why Augustine and his friends were unable to suppress it. It was a real, popular movement, with its own art at well as its own services. The scores of little chapels which we found bore mute witness to its enduring strength. There had been nothing left for the Imperial government but to use force against it. The arguments in favour of persecution with which Augustine supplied the authorities have left an evil legacy from his day to our own.

Where they have been published the contents of some of the newly-discovered documents are as interesting as their discovery. The informality of Church Councils in the third century A.D. is strikingly revealed by a papyrus containing a lost work of Origen, whose discovery during the construction of defence works against Rommel's advance has already been mentioned[12]. Origen himself is introduced at one point with the words: 'This is Origen, who teaches that the soul is immortal'[13], and Origen stands out, not as a misty theologian, but as a fighter for the faith, and a man who believed in the spiritual powers and dignity of his fellow men[14].

Another document provides a striking criticism of Christianity in the third century A.D., written by a great religious leader who saw the new religion from the outside, from the neighbouring country of Persia[15]. Mani criticises Jesus of Nazareth severely for not having put His ideas into writing and for having left them to chance interpretations by ignorant disciples. Christianity, he

[10] A. Berthier, *op cit.*, 205 ff.,; W. H. C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, Oxford, 1952, Ch. iv.

[11] Augustine, *Enarratio* in Ps. 132.6 (*Patrologia Latina*, 37, col. 1732).

[12] J. Scherer, 'Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide et les Evêques ses collègues sur le Père, le Fils et l'Ame' (Publications de la Société Fouad I de Papyrologie, Textes et Documents, ix), Cairo, 1949, p. 1.

[13] *Ibid.*, C. 24 (Scherer, p. 166).

[14] *Ibid.*, C. 24-27.

[15] C. Schmidt and H. J. Polotsky, 'Ein Mani-Fund in Aegypten', *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1933, Phil. Hist. Klasse, 4-89, at pp. 41-42 (Mani, *Kephalaion*, 154).

complains, was a local religion, confined to the 'West', that is, to the Roman Empire, just as Buddhism, which he knew from a visit to India in A.D. 240, was confined to the East[16].

Mani aspired to take what he believed to be the best from both these religions and preach a universal faith, and he saw to it that his ideas were written on the finest papyrus, and translated into a large number of different languages. In vain, for his religion perished almost without trace. It has been left to the present century to re-establish its tenets and appreciate its threat to Christianity.

In England we can hardly hope to match these discoveries which will influence permanently the study of the history of the Early Church. Some interesting additions, however, have been made to our knowledge of the Church in Roman Britain. The Roman villa at Lullingstone, in Kent, has yielded priceless evidence for the existence of a House-church in one of its upper rooms during the late fourth century[17].

The plaster which had decorated the walls of this room had fallen into a cellar below and was preserved practically intact. Many fragments were recovered, and slowly a representation of a church and figures standing praying emerged to the astonishment of the discoverer. The result was entirely unexpected. In other parts of the country the existence of a Christian community of this period is attested by objects marked by Christian symbols. including what appear to be large leaden fonts[18]. There seems to be no doubt that the Church in Roman Britain shared to the full the rites and creeds of the Church throughout the rest of Christendom.

What of the future? From now on the archaeologist will probably be the principal source of new evidence on the early history of the Church. Occasionally monastic libraries may reveal a lost text like the famous discoveries made in 1875 and 1907 of the *Didache* and *Epideixis* of Irenaeus, but this source, valuable though it is, cannot be relied upon permanently. Many of the lost Christian writings originated as letters or tracts written to individuals, or were controversial works composed for a particular occasion. Unless they were copied quickly and preserved in a library (like that of Pamphilus of Caesarea) they would almost certainly be lost. The social standing of many of the writers also

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 42-6 (Mani, *Kephalaion*, 154).

[17] Lieut.-Col. G. W. Meates, *The Roman Villa at Lullingstone Kent*, 1955, ch. xii-xiv.

[18] J. M. C. Toynbee, 'Christianity in Roman Britain', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, XVI, 1953, 15.

would militate against the literary survival of their works. In addition, heretical works such as those of the Manichaeans were systematically destroyed. But factors which would prevent survival of books in a library would not prevent their discovery on an ancient site. Papyrus was valuable, and it has happened that a tract dealing with a half forgotten controversy was used on the back for a more utilitarian purpose, such as making a tax receipt, and so found its way into the office of the village secretary[19]. Moreover, the archaeologist generally directs his efforts towards inquiring into the culture of people whose sole records are their utensils and graves. This has led to the excavation of great Christian cemeteries such as Timgad, and the exploration of artisan quarters in Roman cities where Christianity flourished at an early date. This process is likely to continue.

Thus, a whole new field of study inaccessible to previous generations of scholars and theologians is opening up. There is not only no possibility of Church history stagnating through lack of fresh material, but through archaeology the student has been brought into closer contact with both the environment and the ideas which characterize the Age of the Fathers. Knowledge of both Tradition and Heresy are expanding as never before. At a critical moment in the Church's long history we are able once more to recapture something of the period in which the great traditional doctrines were formulated. This is all to the good, for thus our religion will never lose contact with history.

Except in the distant north-western provinces of the Empire, the Church is revealed from the rudely carved inscriptions, and the rustic buildings and native artistic traditions of its adherents, to have been part of a great popular movement. The statements which we read in the Fathers merely put into articulate form ideas bandied about in the baths or marketplace[20]. This is in itself interesting, because it sheds light on influences at work during the formative period of Church doctrine. Moreover, many problems which have been the sport of literary critics for decades are now liable to rapid solution. Few, for instance, would continue to assert a mid-second-century date for St. John's Gospel when fragments have been found copied on papyrus in hand-writing datable

[19] For instance, fragments of Bk. 18 of the Κέστοι of Julius Africanus written not later than 235 were preserved on the back of a tax register dated to the reign of Tacitus (275-276). See W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*, Tübingen, 1934, 162.

[20] For the intense interest taken in theological problems by the populace in Constantinople in the fourth century, see Gregory of Nazianze, *De Deitate Filii, I, Patrologia Graeco-Latina*, 46, col. 557 B.

to approximately A.D. 150[21]. Similarly, the use of Tatian's *Diatessaron* among the Syrian communities in the early third century can be proved by the discovery of a fragment at Doura-Europos which fell to the Persians in 256 and was not reoccupied[22]. The archaeologist can be relatively accurate where the Higher Critic could only weigh up probabilities. The age of 'demythologising' is past, because more and more accurate information about conditions in Palestine and Asia Minor in the time of Christ is coming to light.

One final point. How far are we in this country participating in this movement? It must be admitted that the answer is less encouraging than it should be. Despite the work of Ramsay and Calder in Asia Minor, and more recently of Ward-Perkins and Goodchild in Tripolitania, the period A.D. 150-350 which saw the great expansion of Christianity is among those least studied here. Partly due to the poverty of our own annals, partly perhaps, to insular conservatism and inertia, the third century A.D. has been written down as 'anarchy', and left as a sort of wilderness of scholarship spurned by Classicist and Mediaevalist alike. Moreover, the Church historian, traditionally literary in his approach and inexperienced in practical archaeology, has tended to study his subject in isolation from its environment. We have not developed an *Antike und Christentum* school in this country. Hence we start with a handicap, for the application of archaeology to the study of the early history of the Church demands just such an approach. One cannot understand, for instance, the significance of the Return of Ulysees fresco in the catacomb of the Aurelii in Rome or, indeed, the whole amalgam of Christian sects and semi-Christianity which flourished there without having absorbed something of the religious life of the late second century[23]. This brings the problem home to us. Rightly the Anglican Communion has always been noted for its scholarship. The names of Lightfoot, Burkitt, Gore, Kidd and Sanday are only few of the great scholars who have served the Church. But reputations do not stand still. The new techniques of study must be learnt laboriously and employed to advantage if our Church is to keep abreast in this field. Here is a challenge worth accepting. For we have the chance as never before of making the past history of the Church intelligible to our contemporaries, and that chance must not be lost.

[21] Pap. Rylands Greek, 457, containing parts of John 18. 31-33, and 18. 37-38. Published by C. H. Roberts, *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel*, Manchester, 1935.

[22] C. H. Kraeling, 'A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Doura', *Studies and Documents*, iii, 1935.

[23] Published by Carlo Cechelli, *Monumenti cristiano-eret ici di Roma*, Rome, 1944, at p. 100.

# NEW HORIZONS FOR MEDICINE AND CHRISTIANITY

By Professor R. K. Harrison, Ph.D., Huron College, Canada

PRIMITIVE man thought of the causative agencies of sickness in non-materialistic terms, even where material objects were involved. When he became ill, he ascribed his pathology to the work of demons and evil spirits, or perhaps to the malevolent desires which prompted the owner of an arrow or knife to wound him with such a weapon. In ancient Mesopotamia, the superstitous inhabitants believed that disease was in the main incurred as the result of an imperfect relationship with the deities, who controlled every aspect of life. There are reasons for believing that they thought of 'accidents' as in some way being brought about by the gods, possibly as a punitive measure. In any event, the fact of disease was taken as an indication that all was not flourishing in the relationships which existed between the gods and men.

Greek science as practised in the medical schools at Cnidus in Asia Minor, and at Cos, in the sixth century B.C. and later, concentrated on the more material aspects of disease, and rejected magico-empirical ideas in favour of observed facts, which were collected, classified and preserved in the form of aphorisms. These early tendencies attained to new heights with the work of Hippocrates and his school, who stressed accurate observation and careful scientific scrutiny of all the symptoms presented in pathology. The medieval Christian period indicates no significant advances upon the theories of Galen, but it introduced a theoretical approach which was to exercise a widespread influence in subsequent times. This was in effect a development of the philosophy of Descartes, and has important bearing upon the theory of personality, as we shall see subsequently. Descartes held that his ability to think convinced him of his existence as an individual, and from this he went on to speculate that he consisted of a substance, whose essence was thought. This latter was the immaterial soul or *substantia cogitans*, which by nature was distinct from the body, or *substantia extensa*, and superior to it on all counts. The pre-Reformation Church adopted this dualism into its own pattern of thinking, and took as its responsibility all that was connected with the soul, whilst at the same time conceding the body to the physician as being his appropriate sphere of interest and activity. This had the effect of splitting up the personality, and by implication denied that the body could affect the state of the soul, or *vice versa*.

Independent scientific thought, particularly in the nineteenth century, laid great stress upon the ability to demonstrate the material nature of pathogenic agencies, and in Continental Europe it was the tendency to think almost entirely in terms of such entities as germs, bacteria and other parasites when contemplating the disease-situation. Our own century witnessed the development of more powerful microscopes for the study of such bacterial organisms, and a host of chemical dyes were introduced into medicine, both as tissue-stains and as therapeutic agents.

In the meantime, however, the fledgling science of psychology had ventured uncertainly upon the scene, and after a doubtful beginning rapidly gained in scope and popularity, as experiments with the human personality produced attestable results. The world learned of the existence of the unconscious mind, and of the dangers attaching to the deliberate burying or repressing of experiences therein. Psychiatry endeavoured to shed light upon mental pathology, and in its researches into the recesses of human personality made us aware that other than purely material factors are present, often as causative agents, in diseases of the mind. Some of the greatest benefits of our time have accrued from such investigations, and from them also have emerged facts which have compelled modern medicine to adopt a new approach to the problems of disease.

This change was brought about largely by the realization that non-material elements were not infrequently found to be aetiological factors in organic diseases, which otherwise presented the normal clinical symptoms. These non-material entities were traced back to the emotional life of the individual, and with this it became evident that the doctor had to reckon with the possibility of mental causative agencies in disease, of which the physical pattern of organic derangement might be the result. So as to establish this procedure as a method for attacking the ever-present problems of pathology, it was decided to give it a name which would indicate the scope of its outlook. Because it saw a fundamental connection between the processes of the mind and those of the body, it was described as *psychosomatic*, i.e. 'mind-body' medicine.

We wish at this point to emphasize that we are dealing with a new method of grappling with old-established problems. It does not supplant the traditional somatic outlook of the doctor, but rather enlarges it by calling attention to the fact that the underlying cause of the disease may have originated at the mental rather than the physical level. Symptomatic treatment of diseases which issue from emotional pathology is now being recognized as a poor substitute for dealing with the ailment at its point of origin.

Though it may take up considerable time and energy, the tracing of psychogenic disease to its starting point in the mind is rewarding in that a definite cure may be expected as a result. The doctor must now look at the patient as a *person*, not an aggregation of physical symptoms, and if this is done, the bridging of the gap between mind and body will lead to a much deeper understanding of the aetiology of a great deal of disease.

We have been using these terms 'mind' and 'body' without offering very much in the way of definition. The latter is fairly obvious in meaning, for it denotes the physical structure, internal and external, of the individual as far as his material appearance is concerned. The term 'mind', however, is capable of a much wider interpretation, and no one definition is wholly satisfactory from a medical point of view. Doctors who are materialistic either by training or inclination may choose to regard mind as nothing more than the physical structure in operation. On the other hand, they may take the view that 'the brain secretes thought just as the liver discharges bile', making mental function a little less materialistic, without, however, raising it above the level of the conditioned reflex. This type of materialism has lost favour in recent years with the realization that whilst glandular secretions may influence personality, they do not determine it. Of course, there are notable instances where under- or over-activity of certain glands will produce a marked alteration in the personality. Where this is in evidence, it may be a congenital condition, or it may result from emotional stress upon that part of the nervous system which regulates the function of the endocrinal glands. Because the latter is so much more frequently the case than the former, we gain the impression that the endocrinal secretions are themselves motivated by complex mental reactions, and that they are thus under the dominance of the personality. Though we realize that it is impossible, in the nature of the case, to recognize the mind in isolation from the body, we find ourselves unable to accept that type of materialistic dogma which thinks of the body-mind relationship as equivalent to that which exists between the structure and the function or organic entities, or which defines mind in terms of glandular response to stimuli issuing from the autonomic nervous system.

Instead, we recognize the existence of a non-physical element in each individual, which includes all that we connote when we speak of the emotional life, and where we find also the characteristic moral and spiritual attitudes of humanity, as well as the broad range of mental and intellectual power. Our view of the situation is deliberately comprehensive, since medicine and religion alike

have suffered in the past from excluding aspects of the case which they imagined to be outside their own terms of reference. In adopting this standpoint, we find it necessary to reject the Cartesian dualism and its theological implications, since we maintain that such an attitude is no longer tenable in the light of modern investigations into human personality. We envisage the individual, mind and body, as a unified, integrated personality, not the incorporation of physico-mental dualism.

Lest we should convey the impression that these discoveries which prompted the recent psychosomatic approach to disease are the exclusive property of our own century, we ought to remark that certain aspects of the general theory were apparent to some who lived in the ages now past. Over two thousand years before the birth of Christ, the Babylonian priest-physicians employed mental therapy as part of their larger programme of healing and rehabilitation, where in their opinion the circumstances warranted such a course. Socrates and Plato were not unaware of the effect which the mind could have upon the well-being of the body. The healing miracles of Jesus Christ were based upon an insight into the nature of human personality which is only now becoming vaguely evident in modern psychosomatic study. St. Paul considerably antedated Freud in his exploration of the subconscious mind, as may be seen in his letter to the Romans, where in the seventh chapter the wilful, rebellious aspect of human personality (*'id'*), the self, and the ' super-ego ' are described in terms of psychological conflict bearing an uncomfortably modern sound.

Our everyday speech preserves idioms and phrases from earlier generations which manifest important psychosomatic implications. Thus, we speak of people being ' liverish ', ' faint-hearted ', ' short-sighted ', and the like, indicating that in these and other expressions we recognize the influence of the mind upon the body. It was not by accident that people in earlier ages associated the state of mind with the nature, appearance and performance of the body, for their general interdependence was clearly evident. But in our own day we have the good fortune to be able to demonstrate clinically what was observed empirically at an earlier period.

The influence of the mind over the body is often insidious, inasmuch as the person concerned may not be aware of the operation of mental mechanisms. This may be for the very good reason that the mental processes which underly emotogenic disease are operative in the unconscious mind. Only when it becomes impossible to repress traumatic experiences any longer do they break through to appear in the physical state in a wide variety of diseases. This is not infrequently the first inkling that the doctor has that all is

not well in the emotional life. Diseases which may be classified as 'emotogenic' or 'psychogenic' are those which have their real origin in the conflicts of the unconscious mind or the interplay of stress and strain within the personality. The unconscious is the storehouse for the many events which leave an impression on our minds. This area of the psyche is the locale of such fundamental personality-ingredients as hope, faith, courage, determination, the will-to-survive, and so on. If certain experiences of the conscious mind are deliberately buried or repressed into the realm of the unconscious because of their distasteful nature, a degree of tension or conflict will ensue whenever the conscious mind receives an appropriate stimulus. When this conflict becomes sufficiently intense, it will emerge under the guise of accredited somatic pathology. The particular intensity required for the transition from mental to physical states is a variable factor, depending upon the type of repressed experience and also upon the personality of the individual concerned. What is clear, however, is that an accumulation of emotional tension will seek an outlet in the body, generally in terms of organic pathology.

The adaptation of organism to environment determines much more in life than the incidence of disease, but it is to this frame of reference that the modern doctor must look when considering the needs of the sick person. It has become increasingly evident within recent years that illness may actually be an erroneous adaptation of organism to environment, which though it may have been consciously embraced within individual experience, is still incorrect and mistaken. Thus, the 'chronic invalid' has probably found that he can best avoid the strains and responsibilities of life by incorporating physical disability into his pattern of life, and thereby allowing others to provide for him and shield him from the rigours of contemporary existence. If such a person were to recover from his ailments, he would be expected to take his normal place in society, and the fact that recovery is delayed furnishes him with an excellent reason for postponing his encounter with everyday life. But if the truth were known, the real reason why he remains ill is that he is afraid of the responsibilities which recovery will bring. His illness is thus an escape-mechanism, and is an illustration of the way in which a mistaken adaptation to environment may occur.

A man, known to the writer, who found himself deeply involved in a business failure, also found that he was able to stave off an appearance in the bankruptcy court by becoming ill a day or two before his case was due to be heard. After this had happened several times, an unsympathetic judge ordered him to be arrested, and when it became evident to the man that further emotional excesses would not be tolerated, he stood trial without exhibiting the slightest hint of his former indisposition.

Psychosomatic illness is curious, and sometimes baffling, in that it may simulate either disease or health. If the latter is the case, the person may convey the appearance of somatic harmony, but on closer observation can be seen to be behaving in the manner of a sick person. Unless one is aware of what may be involved in illness, this sort of somatic manifestation may be dismissed as 'malingering'. On the other hand, it may be taken to be a case of 'nerves'. But wherever it occurs, the discerning practitioner will regard such behaviour as a diseased condition, and will be on the watch for emotional involvement.

> A few years ago, I met a man who, to all outward appearances, was in the best of health, but who, unknown to me at the time, was literally 'worried to death'. His mental condition of chronic fear was such that he soon developed a peptic ulcer, the existence of which was unknown to anyone except himself. His outward cheerfulness only disappeared on the morning when he was found writhing in agony on his bedroom floor, clutching a board-like abdomen which bespoke a perforation of his ulcer. He died shortly afterwards, much to the surprise of his business associates. Apparently he had worried about his aged mother, who had died some months earlier, and in addition he had certain problems in connection with his business, though they were not of a grave nature as far as I could tell. Had I known him a little better, it might have been possible to detect traces of emotional pathology, and even to offer psychotherapeutic help. As it was, he died a victim of worry.

I have mentioned this case because of all the psychosomatic conditions in illness, people are most familiar with the fact, well attested in contemporary literature, that stomach ulcers are chiefly the product of worry. We ought to be aware, of course, that worry can issue in many other diseased conditions of the body and mind, and that the stomach is by no means the sole site of such pathology.

Where psychosomatic illness assumes the conventional role of sickness, an even more complex situation is presented for consideration. In the first instance, it is important for the doctor to be quite sure that the cause of the illness is something other than a purely physical one. There are cases on record of patients who have died from what had been dismissed as 'hysteria', but which on necropsy turned out to be a neoplastic tumour. When the medical practitioner is satisfied that there is no obvious physical causative factor, he then ought to investigate the possibility of a link between mental and physical states, particularly where there has been no significant response to symptomatic therapy. Modern research has shown that so many of the classic diseases may actually be the end-result of emotional pathology that the influence of the mind over the body ought to be considered in every case, whether it proves ultimately to be relevant or not.

This procedure may have the effect of reversing some of the time-honoured opinions regarding the nature of disease in particular situations. Thus, what was perhaps rather casually dismissed as hysterical paralysis, may turn out to be a ruptured intervertebral disc. On the other hand, an occupational accident resulting in the death of an individual may be the direct result of anxiety, fear, anger or guilt, relative to some area of the personal life. Domestic calm is now recognized as an important factor where considerations of personal safety are involved, as in industry or in particularly hazardous enterprises. Recent studies have shown that if a man is distracted through anger, anxiety, resentment, and the like, he is much more likely to become a victim of an 'accident' than the man whose general domestic environment is one of comparative equanimity.

> A short time ago, I was discussing this matter with an electrician who had come to change my electric meter. He told me that he was trained to perform this task whilst the wires were 'live', and he said that his company would not, as a matter of policy, allow anyone whom they thought might have feelings of personal insecurity, worry or resentment to undertake such dangerous work. Fatal accidents had ensued in the past through workmen being unable, as a result of emotional disturbance, to devote to their work the degree of concentration and care which it required.

Pent-up emotions often have curious expression. If one is particularly disgusted, or if one encounters something which 'makes one sick', the release mechanism is to be found in vomiting. But if one pushes down that feeling into the unconscious mind, and lives as though one had never consciously experienced it at all, it is not difficult for a suitable stimulus, occurring, perhaps, many years after the initial event, to produce mental traumata or physical disability by demanding expression for the repressed emotion. Text-books which deal with abnormal psychology offer a wide variety of instances of this sort. We need not look to the incidence of childhood traumata, however, to see the nature of emotogenic disease, as some authorities insist. The stresses of adult life are themselves more than sufficient to occasion a frightening array of pathological states.

The autonomic nervous system which supplies the involuntary musculature of the body is particularly susceptible to such emotional stresses as anger, worry, grief, guilt, shock, and so on. The effect is seen in the 'tightening' of stomach nerves, spasm of the arterial muscle-lining, involuntary bowel action, acceleration of cardiac and suprarenal function, and fainting. The gall-bladder, which contains a good deal of the non-striated muscle which looks for its control to the autonomic nervous system, is very susceptible

to emotional tensions resulting in 'bilious attacks', or in more serious occlusion of the bile-duct. Some medical authorities attribute the incidence of 'blood pressure' to primary emotional states, and a distinct pattern of emotional pathology has been seen by many modern investigators in such diseases as tuberculosis, asthma, arthritis, allergic conditions, certain types of cancerous growths, multiple sclerosis, and many other familiar conditions.

Indeed, the recognition that there is an element of emotional derangement in all disease has led some research workers to look for emotional pathology as the cause of all forms of disease. Whilst this is clearly not the case, it ought to be remarked that even a comparatively slight degree of tension within the personality can predispose an individual to such things as infectious diseases, which might otherwise have been avoided. We are all well aware that it is not too difficult to develop a headache or catch a cold if we wish to use those devices as an excuse for avoiding some unpleasant duty! Whilst, then, we cannot accept the suggestion that *all* diseases are psychogenic, we realize that emotional tension of pathological intensity can and does produce characteristic diseases which may be diagnosed in the normal way. What may not be immediately in evidence is the relationship between mind and body in the disease-situation.

There are some Sadducean doctors who, believing neither in angel, demon nor spirit, would discount completely the possibility of mental factors ever being contributory, in the manner in which we have been thinking, to the final state of somatic pathology. I think it is only fair to say, however, that the average medical man is all too well aware of the influence which the mind can wield over the body, though for obvious reasons he may be reluctant to discuss the matter to any extent. The nature of 'proof' of such a connection may well pose philosophical as well as scientific questions for investigators of a sceptical disposition, and this fact has to be given due recognition. But even when this has been granted, it is difficult to dismiss as uninformed and unscientific the great body of literature which has arisen during the last fifteen years through the work of research into psychosomatic theory. The case-histories which emerge are the lives, emotional and physical, of ordinary men and women, subjected to the pressures of environment. They have become ill in one way or another, sometimes without knowing quite how or why. Such lives have become case-histories because they were unable to adapt themselves successfully to their surroundings.

It is at this point that the work of the Christian Church seems to be relevant. Christianity has, from the beginning, manifested

serious concern, not merely for the welfare of the individual mind and soul, but also for the environment in which the personality has to grow and survive. One of the first expressions of spirituality in the early Church was what is known to-day as 'social work', and it is not always realized by the materialistic critic that a living Christian faith has been the mainspring of every attempt at social amelioration and reform in our western world. As far as the Ministry itself is concerned, the specifically pastoral functions of the clergyman represent the extention of Christianity on the practical level into the realm of ordinary life.

> The Gospel of Christ has as its goal,
> The task of making sick men whole.

Modern psychology and psychiatry have shown us clearly that 'wholeness' can never be predicted of 'body' or 'mind' in isolation from one another. Man is an integrated personality, and attempts to divide up his being into watertight compartments are a contradiction of his entire nature, whether those attempts are made in the name of religion or science. It would appear, then, that our most pressing need in considering the question of ministering to the sick, whether as doctors or clergy, is to envisage the essential unity of the human personality, body and soul, and then to integrate the approaches to healing which may be made, either from the medical or from the spiritual angle. This statement will come as a particular challenge to the clergy, who in the main seem to have but little realization of their proper role in the disease-situation, and who have generally only the vaguest notion of how to co-operate with the doctor in cases of illness.

This state of affairs is unfortunate, to say the least, as the new era which is emerging for doctor and clergyman is one of co-operation, not of mutual exclusion. It appears to the present writer to be of considerable importance for the pastor to be moderately well versed in psychological studies so that he can detect the presence of emotional stress — which is not always easy — and bring the healing and forgiving love of God in Christ to bear upon the situation. If, as is usually the case, he finds that organic pathology is in evidence, it is part of his pastoral duty to relieve tensions in the unconscious mind by employing release-mechanisms in his spiritual counselling. Co-operation between doctor and cleric at this level will invariably produce speedy and beneficent results, for the medical man is fully conscious of the value subsisting in what has been called the 'hygiene of a quiet mind'.

It is the task of the Christian clergyman to make this 'quiet' a real factor in contemporary individual experience. For this task he has not merely the precepts of his Master, but also access to the

same source of Divine Power. The experience of conversion or spiritual deepening by faith in Jesus Christ is itself a powerful therapeutic agent, for it is the beginning of personality-reorientation. If taken seriously, it constitutes the initial step in a continuing experience of increasing quietude and inner calm, which in its own way stabilizes the personality still further. Christ said :

> ' My peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.'

If the would-be believer is prepared to take that statement at its face value, he can spend the rest of his life in exploring the depths of that peace without exhausting its meaning and power. It is not easy to persuade an anxious neurotic to live as though God were in complete charge of affairs, and already attending to his basic needs, but if it can be done, the effect upon the tortured personality is nothing short of marvellous. The reason for this is that the ' perfect love ' of which the Apostles spoke is the specific antidote for fear, and when its gentle influence is allowed to penetrate to the levels of the unconscious mind, it soothes and settles the conflict and turmoil which it encounters there.

One of the emotional states which frequently contributes to a wide variety of bodily or mental illnesses is guilt. The offence in relation to which guilt feelings are experienced may not be of particular magnitude, and may even have become distorted in process of time. Nevertheless, it can initiate a chain-reaction in the emotional life which will ultimately find expression in somatic pathology if unrelieved. Christianity again has the answer to this particular problem, for it is pre-eminently able to relate the offender. The preaching of the Christ is of importance for the healing of the body as well as for the salvation of the soul. However, it is one thing to preach the power of Christ for healing and salvation. It is quite a different matter to apply it *intelligently* in cases of sickness, whether acute or not. The doctor will generally realize as he diagnoses the condition that there is some degree of emotional involvement, which he may not be able to treat. If cleric and doctor are co-operating actively, this information may be shared for mutual profit, and the clergyman will then have some inkling of how he is to apply psychotherapy as a means of restoring the sick person to a state of wholeness. His is the task of bringing relief to those distressed areas of the personality which are beyond the reach of symptomatic medication, and as the man of God, he has access to more than purely human power. I myself have witnessed the rational application of Divine Power at work on many occasions in the relief of mental tension, bringing about almost miraculous restoration from a variety of human ailments.

# METHODISM AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

(Concluding Article)

By Rev. C. J. Wright, B.D., Ph.D.

I CONCLUDED my previous article — in the December *Modern Churchman* — with a question: 'What is the real situation to-day? The main question confronting all men and women of reason and religion to-day is: How can we so present and embody in action a moral and spiritual faith such as can renew the life of the Church in its service of the nation and of mankind?

It is encouraging to note that the new exploratory conversations between Methodism and Anglicanism are specifically stated to be 'unrestricted in range'. This complete freedom of confrontation belongs no doubt to the similar conversations between Presbyterianism and Anglicanism.

The President of the British Association, Sir Robert Robertson, at its annual meeting last September, said:

> 'It will suffice here to note that no use can be made of dogma, nor any weight attached to authority. Hence it is axiomatic that religious, philosophic systems and beliefs can make no contribution to science, and that statement is, one hopes, entirely non-controversial.

That statement reminded me of Tyndall's once-famous Belfast Address before the British Association in 1874. 'Science claims unrestricted right of search', he declared to consenting scientists and to dissenting dogmatic theologians and churchmen. As far as I am aware no theologian or churchman publicly dissented from the utterance of the present President. Yet every educated person knows that in 1874 theological beliefs were generally held to make specific 'contributions to science'—about, for example, what is called 'cosmology'; eliciting the devastating remark of Tyndall that one of the first tasks of science was to wrest the entire domain of cosmological theory from theology. This wresting has been accomplished, save in sheltered places of theological retreat. . . . Nevertheless, in 1956 as in 1874, much use is made by official religion of dogma, and much weight is still made of authority to stifle enquiry and to impose decision in matters belonging to scientific history. No teacher whose studies have led him to doubt such dogmas as 'The Immaculate Conception', 'The Virgin and the Virginal Birth', 'The Assumpton', or indeed to question openly the infallibility of any dogmatic decision of a majority of dead theologians and ecclesiastics, will to-day be in

any wise approved by his institution: at least, not until—like F. D. Maurice—he is dead and can do no more damage to dogma.

It must therefore be the hope of every friend of true Unity that the new conversations between the churches will be indeed 'unrestricted in range'. Needless to say, all conversations, however theoretically 'unrestricted', are, in fact, restricted by the minds of the men who converse. It is this fact of the prevailing dogmatic mind in the circles of all official religion that bridles or tempers optimism when we read of Unity conversations 'unrestricted in range'.

Another very pertinent fact of recent history must bridle optimism. The long, contentious, grudging, and carefully restricted approval in Anglican circles of communion with the Church of South India does not augur well for rapid progress towards a unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life.

Here it is necessary to remember that the Church of South India came into being as the result of missionary, not dogmatic, zeal. The fashioners of this Church sought, like Wesley, to be

> 'the friends of all, the enemies of none'.

And, like the great itinerant of the eighteenth century, they were taught, often reluctantly, to say to every friend of Christian Unity, 'give me your hand'. And, again like Wesley, they were driven to revise old standards of belief. They came to know—as the three uniting Methodist Churches in 1932 came to know—that they could not tie themselves, or those who came after, to 'every word and phrase' even of such hallowed 'creeds' as the 'Apostles Creed' and the 'Nicene Creed'. So the framers of the South India Church, having 'accepted' the two 'creeds' mentioned, went on to make their basic attitude to all dogma as clear as honesty and truth demanded:

> 'we do not intend thereby to demand the assent of individuals to every word and phrase in them, or to exclude reasonable liberty of interpretation, or to assert that those creeds are a complete expression of the Christian faith.'

It was the spirit of John Wesley and of Anglicanism at its highest and deepest—and as representing the most truly religious and most fully rational thinkers of our nation—which dictated this toleration and this liberty: and, I would dare to add, this fidelity to the prophets of Bible and Church. And I would remind my readers of the words of Wesley on the recondite and, to modern men and women, perplexing dogma of the Trinity:

> 'I do not insist upon anyone's using the word Trinity or Person. I use them myself without any scruple, because I know of none better:

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

but if any man has any scruple concerning them, who shall contrain him to use them? I cannot.'

So it was that the Methodists of 1932 inserted into their own 'Deed of Union' this claim :

'The Methodist Church claims and cherishes its place in the Holy Catholic Church which is the Body of Christ.'

'It rejoices in the inheritance of the Apostolic Faith and loyally accepts the fundamental principles of the historic creeds and of the Protestant Reformation.'

One further pertinent fact of recent history has direct relevance, as I believe, to the present Unity conversations. I refer to the proposed 'Revised Canons' now under discussion. Will this revision of mediaeval canons put, as is claimed, the Church's house in order? Or, as is being said in outside and non-domestic quarters where this revision has been read, is it 'another nail in the Church's coffin'?

I must, with the editor's permission, say here what I think of this revision of mediaevalism, and, especially, in relation to the new Unity conversations.

This revision is a chaos without form and void. No spirit has moved on the face of these waters. Throughout there is only the most weak-kneed and parenthetical recognition of the crisis of our times. It seeks for the restoration of obedience and order by buttressing officialdom and by increasing bureaucracy.

Further, this revision evades the challenge of the mission and message of Jesus. I think here chiefly of this issue—the place of the laity in the 'Chaburah', the Fellowship, the 'Congregation' of Jesus : reminding my readers that the latter word was Tyndale's translation of the Greek word 'ecclesia' found only in two passages in the Gospels—and there only in *Matthew*.

It may be asserted with confidence that whatever increase in Unity rewards the new 'conversations', Methodist laymen and laywomen will not be asked to surrender their present rights and duties within the Church—rights and duties, as every historian knows, won slowly and with difficulty. And, further, no fellowship, at present existing between Methodism and the other Free Churches, will be severed. For the Unity that is sought by men and women of good will everywhere is not a manufactured 'union' such as will compete in dogmatic rigidity and superstitious assertion with Rome. Nor is it a 'reunion' that will obliterate the rich diversity of mental, moral and spiritual gifts of Nature and of Nature's GOD. The Unity for which we work and pray must be the Servant not of the dead but of the living.

Proof corrected on March 21, just 400 years after Cranmer in St. Mary's, Oxford, repudiated his 'recantations'.—C.J.W.

# BOOK REVIEWS

## ST. PETER AND BABYLON

*Pharoah to Farouk*, now that Egypt is so much in the news, is a most interesting volume for the general reader. It has much to teach about Egyptian history and not least Egypt in its relation to England since the Battle of the Nile. For English politicians it emphasizes the folly of English Ministers in Whitehall refusing to follow the guidance of English statesmen on the spot but that is not our reason for directing attention to this book here.

Of recent years, especially since the publication of Dr. Streeter's Commentary, followed by Dean Selwyn, etc., the *First Epistle of St. Peter* has received much attention as a very important primitive Christian document. Perhaps the most enigmatic passage in the Epistle is I Peter v, 13.

> 'She that is in Babylon, elect together with *you,* saluteth you; and *so doth* Mark my son'. RV

The AV substitutes 'the Church *that is* at Babylon'.

Two interpretations of this phrase have competed against each other.

1. The wife of St. Peter—St. Peter being a married man like the other apostles—and this interpretation has naturally led to the hypothesis that Mark refers to St. Peter's son, Mark, of whom however we hear nothing in church history.

2. The other interpretation of 'she that is in Babylon' understands it to be a reference to the Christian Church in Rome, and Mark, my son, to refer to the author of the Second Gospel. This interpretation is supported by a very large body of primitive Christian tradition. We know that in *Revelation* plainly Babylon is the name given in the first century to the persecuting capital of the Roman Empire. We know also that St. Mark is closely associated with St. Peter's missionary labours and acted as the Apostle's interpreter or *dragoman* in his addresses recounting to Christian congregations his experiences with the Lord Jesus in His earthly life. These two great bodies of evidence certainly support the interpretation that Babylon and Mark are the right renderings of 1 *Peter* v, 13.

*Pharoah to Farouk* however directs its reader's attention to another interpretation which derives its origin from a pagan source. Strabo, a most reliable historical geographer, writing in 24 B.C., gives an account of a Babylon that exists to this day.

Its importance to us lies in the possibility—perhaps even the *probability*—that it is the Babylon referred to in I Peter v, 13; for local Christian Coptic tradition firmly declares that this was the site of an early community first of Jews, and next of Christians, and that St. Peter stopped in Babylon and wrote his epistle while St. Mark, who had accompanied him from Palestine, went on to his own home in north-west Egypt. Babylon lies among the ruins of the Roman fortress of that name built to the north of Memphis. It is south of Cairo well beyond the C.M.S. hospital, and not far from the river bank. It possesses an exceedingly small church which local tradition declares was built in apostolic times to mark the site where the Holy Family lived for a short time. The value of this last tradition is that it confirms the tradition for the existence of a Jewish community here in apostolic times. For ourselves we doubt the reliability of this identification of I Peter v, 13.

Had it occurred in connection with St. Matthew and his Gospel we should have been prepared to accept it as highly probable. We do well however to be aware of its existence and are glad to have it recalled. H.H.K.

* *Pharoah to Farouk*, by H. Wood Jarvis (John Murray, 1955).

## A LIVING FAITH

We desire to draw attention to a booklet by Dr. James Parkes under the title *A Living Faith,* published by the Modern Churchmen's Union price 1/-.

It is amazingly difficult to compress an arresting apology for the Christian Religion in its present-day environment into a tract of sixteen pages and without being open to the charge of emotionalism and special pleading when he concludes by coming down on the side of the Angels. An example of his style is furnished in the following citation:

> 'The world shows that *together* we have freedom, responsibility, and the power of growth, and that *individually* we enjoy these things, not in a vacuum, but in a complex of relationship and dependence on others. There is nothing in such a situation to contradict a belief in a God Whose purpose is Love, or, as we could better express it in the present context, active benevolence towards His creation . . .
>
> Unquestionably we can see terrible dangers ahead if we misuse our scientific knowledge, but the words if *we* misuse it are essential, for there is nothing outside ourselves which compels us to throw atomic bombs at each other. If we misuse our discoveries we cannot blame God. We could blame Him if the vision of what life might be for humanity was clearly unrealisable because the world did not contain the raw material for such a life. But this is not so. Side by side with preparations for the folly of atomic war, men are already making preparations which would make life worth living, not to small minorities in selected countries, but to all men and in all countries. They can already see what such a fuller life might be—but that does not mean that there is any mechanical certainty of its achievement. In fact it is already obvious that the opposite is true. The increase of freedom and of growth will mean increase of responsibility. Greater opportunities will make possible greater catastrophies; and every achievement will mean greater sense of mutual dependence, greater discipline for the individual and the community. It would be no improvement of our present political disorder and poverty if we were to become the regimented sheep of a world bureaucracy—and the danger of that is a real one. But none of the evident dangers of the future should be allowed to impair our conviction that the progress of the world to the full use of its capacities is intended by God and possible to men if they will co-operate with Him.' (p. 8 f.)

It is to be noted that Dr. Parkes (like Professor Bethune-Baker) writes as a member of the Church of England and with a true understanding of the potentialities of that Christian denomination. He concludes with the following *practical* paragraph.

> 'It is no part of the tradition of the Church of England to claim that she alone possesses the truth, or that she possesses the whole truth. She stands as one member of the great body of Christian experience throughout the world. But she can fulfil her own responsibilty, and make her contribution to the whole of Christian witness, only as she can show that she understands how to express her Christian message in terms which men today can appreciate, and which are relevant to their problems and their manners of thinking. That is the task to which the Modern Churchmen's Union calls its members, clergy, laymen and women, in a situation where a liberal and progressive faith is more than any individual can achieve in isolation, more than any group would wish to keep just to themselves, but where such a faith could give hope, peace of mind, and unquenchable courage to a generation desperately in need just of these three qualities.' (p. 15 f.)

H.D.A.M.